AUG 24 1959

2 vols 12/6

Presented to
United
Theological Seminary
Library
Dayton, Ohio

by

Dr. Arthur C. Core

C/

CONFIRMATION
OR
THE LAYING ON OF HANDS

CONFIRMATION

OR

THE LAYING ON OF HANDS

VOLUME I

HISTORICAL AND DOCTRINAL

BY VARIOUS WRITERS

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
BV
815
.C6635
V. 1
47,465

LONDON
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NEW YORK AND TORONTO: THE MACMILLAN CO.
Printed in Great Britain

First published 1926

PREFACE

The primary purpose of the present volume is to provide such information about the Laying on of Hands as will give Anglican clergy, whose pastoral activity is so much concerned with Confirmation, the historical and doctrinal background of their work. The history of the rite is traced from the New Testament down to the nineteenth century in three chapters by Dr. Clarke, Dr. Maclean, and Canon Ollard. Dr. Feltoe's chapter on the liturgical evidence is a natural companion to these three essays. The short accounts of the administration of Confirmation in the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches, by Mr. Hardy and Mr. French respectively, are intended to give those whose main interest lies in the Anglican system a little information about other parts of the Church. Mr. Mackenzie then discusses the relation of Confirmation to Baptism, which has been touched on by the previous writers but not worked out. Dr. Relton closes the volume with a study of the theological and philosophical implications of Confirmation. His ninth section treats of the practical significance of the rite, and points forward to a companion volume, dealing with practical matters, which is in preparation.

While the main purpose of the book is as described above, Canon Ollard's essay is far longer than the rest, and will be recognized as an important first-hand contribution to Church History. The other articles were written some years before his, and the publication of the book was delayed to allow him to complete his researches.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. LAYING ON OF HANDS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT . 1

By W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, D.D.

II. THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF CONFIRMATION IN THE CHURCH UP TO THE REFORMATION 25

By A. J. MACLEAN, D.D., Bishop of Moray, Ross, and Caithness.

III. CONFIRMATION IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION 60

By S. L. OLLARD, M.A., Canon of Worcester.

IV. CONFIRMATION RITES 246

By C. L. FELTOE, D.D.

V. CONFIRMATION IN (A) CHURCHES OF THE LATIN RITE 270

By T. J. HARDY, M.A.

(B) THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH . . 281

By R. M. FRENCH, M.A., Secretary of the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association.

VI. THE RELATION OF CONFIRMATION TO BAPTISM 285

By K. D. MACKENZIE, M.A.

VII. THE THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF CONFIRMATION 295

By H. MAURICE RELTON, D.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology, King's College, University of London.

INDEX 339

CONFIRMATION
OR
THE LAYING ON OF HANDS

CHAPTER I

LAYING ON OF HANDS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

By W. K. Lowther Clarke

SUMMARY

I. Gentile Analogies.
II. The Old Testament.
III. The New Testament Evidence.
  1. Laying on of Hands as an Act of (*a*) Healing, (*b*) Blessing.
  2. Laying on of Hands in Confirmation.
  3. Laying on of Hands in Ordination.
  4. Traces in the Epistles.
  5. Other Passages.
IV. Discussion of the Evidence.

I. Gentile Analogies

The two Sacraments of the Gospel, generally accepted as having been ordained by Christ Himself, are based upon the primary human needs of washing and eating. In like manner the outward sign in Confirmation testifies to a universal fact—the power of the hand. Man alone among creatures possesses this wonderful instrument, for the ape's fore-limbs cannot be called true hands. It has been thought that to the mind of primitive man the hand once seemed to have an independent existence; certainly it was looked upon with awe in early religions as the mysterious means by which power was conveyed from one person, divine or human, to another.[1]

---

[1] Note that χεῖρες in Greek = δυνάμεις, and that Latin *manus* has the dual meaning of "hand" and "armed band."

In Greek and Roman art a god is frequently depicted with hand outstretched to heal or bless. Asklepios especially, the healing god, laid his hands upon men. Inscriptions in his honour, whether at Epidauros in the fourth century B.C., or in the Asklepeium on the island in the Tiber dating from the early imperial period, describe how the god came and laid his hand upon the sufferer who had come to sleep in the temple for a cure. Certain medicines, according to Plutarch, were described as "God's hands."[1] A well-known example of miraculous power exercised by a man's hands is the raising of a dead girl to life at Rome by Apollonius of Tyana, narrated by Philostratus. "Merely touching her and whispering in secret some spell over her, he at once woke up the maiden from her seeming death."[2]

The subject is worked out in learned monographs, but nothing would be gained for our purpose by pursuing it further. Something would be demonstrated which no one has thought it worth while to doubt, that our Lord and His disciples, when they laid their hands upon people, were employing a rite or gesture which was familiar to the Gentile world of the day. Analogy never proves origin, and we have here a common use of a universal human gesture.[3]

II. The Old Testament

The hand is frequently mentioned in the Old Testament, both in a literal and metaphorical sense. The constant references to the hand of God are metaphorical, though if it should be maintained that in the primitive sources which lie behind our Old Testament God was conceived of as having literal hands the thesis cannot be disproved. The hand is the instrument of healing (2 Kings v. 11), and of blessing, which is imparted to a congregation without contact (Lev. ix. 22), and to an individual by contact (Gen. xlviii. 14), exactly as in the Christian Church.

---

[1] *Symposiaca*, IV. i. 3. "But if, Philinus, you are against all mixtures, do not chide Philo only for the variety of his dishes or sauces, but also for using many mixtures in his sovereign antidotes, which Erasistratus calls *God's hands*."

[2] Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* iv. 45.

[3] See Weinreich, *Die antike Heilungswunder*, pp. 1-67, and *cf.* art. "Hand" in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*.

An incident of great importance, deserving careful consideration, is the "ordination" of Joshua. "The Lord said unto Moses, Take thee Joshua, the son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit, and lay thine hand upon him; and set him before Eleazar the priest, and before all the congregation; and give him a charge in their sight. And thou shalt put of thine honour upon him."[1] A brief reference to this appears in Deut. xxxiv. 9: "And Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom; for Moses had laid his hands upon him." Both passages are ascribed to the Priestly Code, and reflect the practice of the fifth or sixth century B.C., perhaps that of an earlier date. There are differences in the two accounts. Numbers represents Moses as laying his hand, Deuteronomy his hands, upon Joshua; in Numbers Joshua already has the spirit, in Deuteronomy the imparting of the spirit seems to be attributed to the action of Moses. But perhaps no difference of theological meaning is intended. In the light of Gen. xli. 38 ("Can we find such a one as this, a man in whom the spirit of God is?") we may take capacity for administration to be the main idea conveyed by "spirit."

The verb *samakh*, to rest (the hand) upon, is used in several ways: (i) Of the sacrifice of an animal victim, especially in the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement: "Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, even all their sins; and he shall put them upon the head of the goat."[2] (ii) Closely connected with this is the solemn protestation against a person found in Lev. xxiv. 14 and Susannah 34, where the guilt of an offence is put symbolically upon the offender. (iii) The use of the rite accompanying a blessing has already been mentioned.[3] (iv) In the passages discussed above[4] power is transferred from one holder of an office to another.[1] Clearly the idea of transference covers all these instances; it has been suggested that the ceremony was originally connected with the transference of property.[2]

---

[1] Num. xxvii. 18-20. "Of thine honour" is partitive = some of thine honour.

[2] Lev. xvi. 21.

[3] Gen. xlviii. 14.

[4] Num. xxvii. 18-20; Deut. xxxiv. 9.

There is no parallel in the Old Testament to the "ordination" of Joshua. But a similar ceremony appears in later Judaism, and when Jewish tradition asserts that a regular ordination of elders by elders was practised it deserves respectful consideration. In view of the tenacity of religious customs, it is highly probable that a practice for which we have evidence both in the Pentateuch and in Rabbinic Judaism prevailed also in the intervening period for which there is no evidence.

The same word—*Semikah*—is used both for the ceremony obligatory on all who offered animal sacrifices and for ordination. In the time of Alexander Jannæus ordained elders only were admitted to the Sanhedrin. The same rules applied to smaller councils in the provinces, and even Rabbis were ordained. After the Bar-Kokhba war and the second destruction of Jerusalem the custom of ordination revived, but fell into desuetude as it came to be realized that the breach with the Christian Church was irreparable. It is generally held that the prevalence of a similar custom in the Church contributed to its abolition.[3]

We need not look further than this rite of laying on of hands practised in Judaism at the time of the birth of Christianity for the historical precursor of the Christian rite with its various significations.

III. The New Testament Evidence

Coming now to our main subject, we proceed to discuss the evidence under five heads. The interpretation of the evidence as a whole will be reserved for the present.

---

[1] See G. B. Gray on Num. xxvii. 18 in *Int. Crit. Comm.*

[2] *Jewish Encyclopædia*, art. "Semikah."

[3] See articles "Ordination" and "Semikah" in *Jewish Encyclopædia*; and Behm, *Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum*, pp. 122 ff. This book is the most helpful I know on the subject. *Cf.* Pirke Aboth i. 1 (ed. Oesterley, p. 1): "Moses received the Torah from Sinai, and he delivered it to Joshua, and Joshua to the Elders, and the Elders to the Prophets, and the Prophets to the men of the Great Synagogue"; and Sanhedrin, Tosefta i. 1 (ed. Danby, p. 26): "The *Semika* is to be decided by three, and the 'laying on of the elders' hands' by three; but R. Jehuda holds that it is by five." Note the analogy of the three consecrators of a Bishop.

1. *Laying on of Hands as an Act of* (a) *Healing*, (b) *Blessing*

(*a*) In various passages of the Gospels we find our Lord healing by laying on of hands. He touched the leper,[1] Peter's wife's mother,[2] a few sick persons at Nazareth,[3] the man with an impediment in his speech,[4] the blind man at Bethsaida,[5] two blind men,[6] two blind men again at Jericho,[7] the woman with a spirit of infirmity,[8] and the high priest's servant.[9] He was a focus of physical as well as spiritual salvation, and the outward act of laying on of hands was the means by which salvation was radiated to others.

So clearly was this recognized that some reversed the process and touched Christ. Thus, in the district round Gennesaret the sick were brought into the streets, and begged to be allowed to touch even the hem of His garment, and as many as touched Him were made whole.[10] We must not suppose there was anything magical about this, as if even by faith they could draw a healing from Him without His consent. As we see from the parallel case of the woman in the crowd,[11] such cures were wrought with the gracious consent of the Lord at the cost of a definite expenditure of vitality; He perceived that virtue had gone out of Him.

These acts of healing are Messianic. The sermon at Nazareth, placed by St. Luke at the beginning of the ministry, quoting a passage of Isaiah,[12] says that giving sight to the blind is one of the signs of the Messianic time, and claims that the prophecy is now fulfilled; and Matt. iv. 23[13] couples the preaching of the gospel of the kingdom with the healing of disease.

---

[1] Mark i. 41; Matt. viii. 3; Luke v. 13.

[2] Matt. viii. 15. [3] Mark vi. 5. [4] Mark vii. 32. [5] Mark viii. 23, 25.

[6] Matt. ix. 29. [7] Matt. xx. 34. [8] Luke xiii. 13. [9] Luke xxii. 51.

[10] Mark vi. 56; Matt. xiv. 36; *cf.* Acts v. 15, xix. 12.

[11] Mark v. 27; Matt. ix. 20; Luke viii. 44. Ideas of healing by "animal magnetism" or suggestion would seem to be foreign to the thought of the apostolic age.

[12] Luke iv; Isa. lxi. 1, 2. [13] Repeated ix. 35; *cf.* xi. 5 and Luke vii. 22.

In the Acts the Central Figure is withdrawn except to the eye of faith, but the Messianic time continues, and so do the works of healing. The afterglow of the great appearance lasts for some while, as the Apostles and others carry on the works of mercy. The Church at Jerusalem prays that God will stretch out His hand to heal and to cause wonders to be wrought through the name of Jesus.[1] "In the name of" means "in union with," "in virtue of the personal power of." It is Jesus who heals by means of His servants. Examples of the healing power of the early Church are too familiar to need quotation. It is sufficient to mention Acts v. 12, xxviii. 8, where laying on of hands is emphasized. We may assume that the "gifts of healing" of 1 Cor. were normally exercised in this manner.

One passage needs fuller treatment in order to justify its inclusion in this section, as a good deal turns on its interpretation—Acts ix. 12 ff. Saul, in his seclusion at Damascus, sees Ananias coming to him and laying his hands upon him that he may recover his sight. Ananias, having entered the house, lays his hands upon him, saying he is sent by the Lord Jesus that Saul may receive his sight. Verse 17, describing the coming of Ananias, fulfils the vision of verse 12. The result of verse 17 is given in verse 18. We now give verse 17 in full: "That (*a*) thou mayest receive thy sight, and (*b*) be filled with the Holy Ghost." Verse 18 runs: "(*a*) Straightway there fell from his eyes as it were scales, and he received his sight, and (*b*) he arose and was baptized." As 18 (*a*) answers to 17 (*a*), so 18 (*b*) answers to 17 (*b*). The baptism—following presumably after an interval[2]—consists of a twofold rite, Baptism and the laying on of hands. It is natural, referring to Baptism, to designate it by its all-important accompaniment, the gift of the Holy Ghost.[3]

---

[1] Acts iv. 30.

[2] "He arose" suggests that Saul left his dwelling and joined the disciples of Damascus.

[3] Commentators generally explain this passage as an exceptional case in which Confirmation preceded Baptism. *Cf.* Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 95. "The laying on of hands precedes Baptism, and is

(*b*) If the blessing of health[1] is mediated to the sick by the laying on of hands, in one instance at least a similar blessing is given to those who are not apparently ill. Parents[2] bring their children to Christ that He should touch them. There is evidence of such a custom in the later synagogue.[3] Spiritual blessings are expected—that He should lay His hands upon them and pray[4]—and it is reasonable to suppose that His practice on other occasions, with children if not with adults, had led them to expect a similar action on this occasion.

In Luke xxiv. 50 we read of Jesus about to ascend into heaven stretching out His hands to bless the disciples, and in Apoc. i. 17 He lays His hands upon St. John.

There is a disputed passage in the Acts—xiii. 1-3—in which we take laying on of hands to be simply a solemn form of blessing. In the Church of Antioch five prophets and teachers—Barnabas, Symeon, Lucius, Manaen, and Saul—are holding a service of prayer and are fasting when the Holy Ghost, speaking no doubt in the ecstatic utterance of one of their number, bids them separate Barnabas and Saul for the work to which He has called them. Then (after a period of deliberation) they (apparently the three who were not going, but possibly unnamed presbyters) fasted and prayed,[5] and, laying their hands upon Barnabas and Saul, dismissed them. The word used, ἀπέλυσαν, is exactly our "dismissed." The service was a dismissal or

---

given by a disciple who, so far as we know, held no office in the Church." Some lay stress on Damascus being in Syria, and quote anomalous customs in the Syriac-speaking Church, by which Confirmation preceded Baptism. But why make difficulties when by a legitimate exegesis the passage can be brought into line with the general custom of the Church?

[1] The healing of the paralytic man, Mark ii. 1-5 and pars., illustrates the intimate connexion of physical and spiritual health.

[2] Mark x. 13; Matt. xix. 13; Luke xviii. 15. As there is no mention of mothers, Mark and Matthew probably imagine fathers bringing boys; παιδία need not mean *little* children (*cf.* John xxi. 5). Luke, however, who uses βρέφη, would seem to think of mothers.

[3] *Cf.* Buxtorf, *Syn. Jud.*, p. 138. No other reference seems to be given by writers on the subject, and if no further data have been accumulated since the beginning of the seventeenth century, the value of the reference is small.

[4] So Matthew.

[5] Aorists, not presents as before.

blessing of missionaries. To take it of ordination is unsatisfactory. Why should Barnabas, who was so closely linked with the Twelve, be ordained at Antioch by men of less weight than himself; and can we reconcile St. Paul's insistence that he received his commission directly from the risen Christ with an ordination at Antioch?

2. *Laying on of Hands in Confirmation*

The important passages are as follows:

(*a*) *Acts* viii. 4 ff.—Philip, one of the Seven, an evangelist,[1] goes down to "a (the) city of Samaria."[2] If we read "the city," the obvious meaning to English ears is that he went to Samaria—that is, Sebaste—a Gentile stronghold at the time.[3] If so, the immense importance of his mission would seem to lie in the admission of Gentiles to the Church for the first time. But St. Luke can hardly have intended this. In i. 8 stress is laid on the three stages of expansion—Jerusalem and Judæa, Samaria, and the outside world—and in chapter x the reception of Gentiles is clearly regarded as an innovation. So it is better to take the Samaritans of chapter viii to be the religious sect whose headquarters were at Sichem (Shechem).[4]

The Samaritans were influenced by Philip's preaching, and were baptized.[5] The Church at Jerusalem, hearing what had happened, sent Peter and John. Philip had not felt able to lay hands upon the converts with prayer for the Holy Ghost, although he was "an ecstatic" himself,[6] and would no doubt have employed laying on of hands in the course of his "signs."[7] We may surmise that the responsibility of bestowing the Spirit upon the schismatic, possibly

---

[1] Acts xxi. 8.

[2] Westcott and Hort, following A and B, print the article; von Soden follows D and other good authorities in omitting it.

[3] *Cf.* G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 348.

[4] *Cf.* John iv.; Sir. l. 26. Perhaps Luke wrote τὴν πόλιν, and the difficulty discussed in the text, being felt in early days, led to the omission of the article.

[5] Not the passive, as elsewhere in this connexion. Philip probably had attendants; he was doing apostolic work, and would not have baptized in person.

[6] See latter part of chap. viii and xxi. 9.

[7] Acts viii. 6.

Gentile, Samaritans was more than he felt justified in taking. It may have already come to be considered incongruous that any man below apostolic rank should take this upon himself. The Apostles came and prayed for the Samaritans that they might receive the Holy Ghost. The mention of prayer shows us how gratuitous is the assumption sometimes made that the apostolic age attributed a magical efficacy to the rite. They then proceeded to lay their hands upon the various groups of converts,[1] who received the Holy Ghost with an accompaniment of outward signs which powerfully affected Simon Magus.[2]

(*b*) *Acts* xix. 1-6.—There are at Ephesus twelve disciples of John the Baptist who have been baptized with his baptism. They form a small body, and there is no justification for supposing an "order" of John's disciples. They may have been baptized by John himself in Jordan. St. Paul asks whether they received the Holy Ghost at the time when they made their profession of faith. They answer, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost," or [to draw out the meaning] "whether the Holy Ghost foretold by Joel and the other prophets, of whom we heard from John, is actually come and now operating in the world." "Then what is your baptism ?" "John's." St. Paul then points out the true meaning of John's baptism : it was one of repentance, and pointed to Jesus who was to come. They were then baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus ; St. Paul did not normally, so it would seem, baptize in person.[3] But he laid his hands on them ; they received the Holy Ghost, and spoke with tongues and prophesied.

Two baptisms are found in this passage, both baptisms with water ; but John's baptism is anticipatory, while Christian Baptism is in the name of Jesus, initiating the convert into a personal relation with Him: attached to it is the rite of laying on of hands by which the Holy Ghost is conveyed.

---

[1] The verbs are in the imperfect tense.

[2] It is only fair to remind the reader that many Protestant scholars to-day (*e.g.* Peake's *Commentary, in loc.*) reject this narrative as unhistorical. That the Apostles could have been so undemocratic as to reserve to themselves the administration of this rite is judged incredible by some writers, who therefore date the story from a later period of growing hierarchical pretensions.

[3] 1 Cor. i. 17.

There is a parallel story in Acts xviii. 24-26. Apollos has an accurate knowledge of the way of God, of the Old Testament oracles which pointed the way to Christ, and of the historic Jesus. Yet he knows only the baptism of John. The obvious explanation is that he was a Galilean disciple during the ministry. Priscilla and Aquila expound the way of the Lord to him more exactly, and in the light of xix. 1-6 we may suppose that this includes rebaptism in the name of Jesus and the reception of the Spirit through the laying on of hands.

(*c*) *Heb.* vi. 1, 2.—Six first principles of the doctrine of Christ are here mentioned: (1) Repentance, (2) Faith, (3) Baptism, (4) Confirmation, (5) Resurrection, (6) Judgment; (3) and (4) are closely joined. The aorist participles in verse 4 point to the definite act of Baptism-Confirmation, "were made partakers of the Holy Ghost," referring naturally to the second part of the rite. There is no need for Westcott's interpretation of *βαπτισμῶν* = lustral rites. Teaching[1] about baptisms (two are mentioned in Acts xix) and the laying on of hands (primarily Confirmation) is an obvious and satisfactory sense.

(*d*) 2 *Tim.* i. 6.—Bishop Chase's exposition[2] is convincing. Whereas the context of 1 Tim. iv. 14 points clearly to Ordination, that of 2 Tim. i. 6 points equally clearly to Confirmation. In verse 5 St. Paul is referring to Timothy's home life. He goes on to urge Timothy to "stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the laying on of my hands. For God did not give us [Timothy and himself, as members of the Church] the spirit of fearfulness,[3] but of power, and love, and soberness." The last clause describes the gifts of all Christian people rather than the special gifts of the ministry.

3. *Laying on of Hands in Ordination*

Ordination is outside our main subject, but in view of the ambiguity of certain New Testament passages which have been taken to refer either to Confirmation or Ordination it will be useful to give the passages. The idea is the same in both—the transference of the Spirit as an equipment for Christian life and duty. Confirmation is for all. Ordination may be considered in the light of a specialized form of Confirmation in view of the duties of the ministry.

---

[1] The authority of B is not sufficient to justify διδαχὴν against διδαχῆς of the other Greek MSS.

[2] *Confirmation in the Apostolic Age*, pp. 35 ff.

[3] Cf. Rom. viii. 15.

Acts vi. 5.—The Seven are ordained for the work of serving. Some scholars doubt whether this is the historic origin of the diaconate; both Stephen and Philip are depicted as preachers primarily. But the difficulty is not sufficient to justify us in setting aside the traditional interpretation. Stephen, the leader of the Seven, is already full of the Holy Ghost[1]; he and the others are now ordained.

Acts xiv. 23.—Paul and Barnabas appoint elders in every Church. Apart from other evidence, the verb χειροτονήσαντες could not be pressed. As it is, we are justified in finding a reference to laying on of hands.

1 *Tim.* iv. 14.—"Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of hands of the presbytery." The college of elders established by St. Paul in the cities of Asia Minor[2] have assisted the Apostle in laying hands upon Timothy. Ecstatic utterance during worship has designated Timothy as suitable for the work.[3]

1 *Tim.* v. 22.—"Lay hands hastily on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins." In the absence of any support in the New Testament for the theory that this refers to the restoration of the excommunicate, we must interpret this of Ordination, though Confirmation is conceivable. Timothy incurs a share in the guilt of others if he admits unworthy men to the ministry.[4]

---

[1] Would not St. Luke have meant by this that he was confirmed? *Cf.* Num. xxvii. 18-20, where Joshua before ordination has the spirit.

[2] Acts xiv. 23.

[3] *Cf.* Acts xiii. 1.

[4] If scholars are right in taking the Ascension of Isa. vi-xi to be a first-century Christian writing, vi. 4, 5 are further evidence for Ordination during the period discussed. "They [the prophets] had come to salute him [Isaiah] and to hear his words. And that he might place his hands upon them, and that they might prophesy and that he might hear their prophecy." See the whole chapter.

4. *Traces in the Epistles*

The question is sometimes asked: If Sacraments were so important in the apostolic age as you allege, why does St. Paul say so little about them, and so much, for example, about faith in relation to works? The answer is that the Apostle assumes what was common ground to himself and his readers, discussing at length only what was controversial. This is obvious when we think about it. If there had been no disorders in connexion with the Eucharist at Corinth, how much should we know of St. Paul's teaching about this Sacrament? His Epistles were called forth by special circumstances; in some cases they are answers to letters which have not been preserved. There were no disputes about Baptism, and so its immense importance in the Apostle's mind is not always manifest to the casual reader. But, reading between the lines, we see it on almost every page. Commentators have rightly laid stress on "baptismal aorists." We constantly find verbs in the aorist tense, pointing to a definite crisis and experience in the Christian life which can only be the initiation into the fellowship of the body of Christ. Let us look at some of these passages, confining ourselves to those in which the Spirit is mentioned.

"The love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Ghost which was given unto us."[1] "Ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father."[2] "We received . . . the Spirit which is of God."[3] "He . . . that anointed[4] us, is God; who also sealed us, and gave us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts."[1] "We were all made to drink of one Spirit."[2] "If ye receive a different spirit, which ye did not receive."[3] "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?"[4] "God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father."[5] "In whom having also believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise."[6] "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, in whom ye were sealed unto the day of redemption."[7] "He saved us, through the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost."[8]

---

[1] Rom. v. 5. [2] Rom. viii. 15. [3] 1 Cor. ii. 12.

[4] There is no direct evidence in the New Testament for the use of unction as an accompaniment of Baptism, so that the question must always remain unsettled. But there is a probability, more apparent to some minds than to others, that it was used; for (i) the religious use of the ceremony was familiar to the disciples from its occurrence in the Old Testament, where it is used for the consecration of persons to the offices of prophet, priest, and king; (ii) in the Mediterranean world, among Jew and Gentile alike, oil was the normal accompaniment of the bath; (iii) it accompanied healing (Jas. v. 14), which we have seen to be closely connected with Confirmation so far as the use of the hands went; (iv) the metaphorical use of "anoint" in 2 Cor. i. 21, 1 John ii. 20, 27 has more point if it is based upon actual practice; (v) Baptism, Unction, Laying on of Hands, were the three parts of the initiatory rite in the post-apostolic Church. See Tert. *de Bapt.* 7.

To these Pauline passages a few may be added from the Catholic Epistles. "Doth the Spirit which He made to dwell in us long unto envying?"[9] "According as each hath received a gift."[10] "The anointing which ye received of Him abideth in you."[11] "The Spirit which He gave us."[12]

None of these passages may be said with certainty to refer to Baptism apart from laying on of hands. But if Scripture is allowed to be its own interpreter, and the Acts to explain the Epistles, St. Paul is seen to be referring to the laying on of hands, which was an integral part of the baptismal rite. The two parts of the rite appear plainly in Titus iii. 5; in the other passages they are not distinguished explicitly; but in the light of Western practice we are able to make explicit the distinction, which was no doubt implicit from the first.[13]

5. *Other Passages*

There remain some passages of essential importance which do not fall under any of the foregoing heads.

---

[1] 2 Cor. i. 21, 22.

[2] 1 Cor. xii. 13.

[3] 2 Cor. xi. 4.

[4] Gal. iii. 2.

[5] Gal. iv. 6.

[6] Eph. i. 13.

[7] Eph. iv. 30.

[8] Tit. iii. 5.

[9] Jas. iv. 5.

[10] 1 Pet. iv. 10.

[11] 1 John ii. 27 (*cf.* ii. 20; 2 Cor. i. 21).

[12] 1 John iii. 24.

[13] Mason, *The Relation of Baptism to Confirmation*, p. 40, discusses 1 Cor. x. 1 ff: "Our fathers were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. And did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink." The reference is to anticipations of the two Christian Sacraments. Each is twofold; the Eucharist clearly so. Baptism is in the sea, a type of the water of Christian Baptism; and in the cloud, a type of the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit given us in Confirmation.

(*a*) *The Baptism of John.*—After generations in which there has been no prophet, a great prophet arises in the wilderness of Judæa. His message is primarily eschatological, in that he prepares those that come to him for God's approaching judgment. All must put away their sins, that they may be able to stand when He appeareth. The outward symbol of repentance is Baptism; undergoing this, the Jews confess that they, though circumcized, are outside the new covenant, and must enter as proselytes. But John is only a forerunner of One to come. He says: "I baptize[1] you with water; but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." The idea of the outpouring of the Spirit is based upon Joel ii. 28 and Ezek. xxxix. 29. In the first and third Gospels the thought is amplified by the addition of "and with fire."[2] This is derived from Mal. iii, which is the other great passage upon which John's preaching rests—"He is like a refiner's fire."[3] Commentators generally take the "but" as marking a strong contrast, but it need not be more than a connecting particle; in which case the idea is: "He who is baptized by him (John) has the certainty that he will share in the outpouring of the Spirit which shall precede the Judgment."[4]

(*b*) *The Baptism of Jesus.*—Jesus comes to Jordan and is baptized by John. After the actual Baptism the Holy Spirit descends "like a dove."[5] We need not discuss the meaning of the Baptism; its main purpose in the mind of our Lord seems to have been to identify Himself, so far as being sinless He could, with the penitence and aspirations for purity of His nation. The illapse of the Holy Ghost which followed corresponded in His experience with Confirmation in the experience of Christians. Since His Conception He "was in all things guided and controlled by the Spirit of God. . . . As His Conception was the beginning of His human existence, so was the Baptism of His ministry. The Messiah was about to enter on His official life . . . and must receive a new outpouring of the Spirit"[1] to equip Him for His work.

---

[1] Mark i. 8. Ἐβάπτισα represents the Semitic perfect, and is rightly altered to *βαπτίζω* by Matthew and Luke for Greek readers.

[2] Matt. iii. 11; Luke iii. 16. Perhaps, however, "and with fire" merely prepares for the burning of the chaff in Matt. iii. 12 and Luke iii. 17.

[3] Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 41, needlessly doubts the genuineness of the addition. "The words are perhaps due to recollection of the Pentecost." But if, as seems likely, the addition was in Q, from the standpoint of recent criticism its authority is greater than that of the Pentecost narrative in Acts. Moreover, "fire" occurs in the Joel passage as well as in Malachi.

[4] Schweitzer, *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 376. Matt. iii. 7 assumes that Baptism saves from wrath to come.

[5] The vision is what in modern language would be called mystic or psychic. All four Evangelists agree that the descent of the Holy Ghost was "*like* a dove."

(*c*) *Baptism during the Ministry.*—The disciples seem to have carried on the baptism of John. There could have been no idea at this time what Christian Baptism was to mean. The circle of eschatological ideas in which they lived made it natural to baptize new followers who had not submitted themselves to John's baptism. There is a puzzling notice in the fourth Gospel to the effect that Jesus baptized in person, to which the *caveat* is appended: "though Jesus Himself baptized not, but His disciples."[2] The inference has been drawn that the Evangelist found the statement in his document, but added a disclaimer in deference to the Synoptic tradition, which gave no support to the belief that the Lord baptized in person. No theological deductions of importance need follow if the assumed document was right and the comment mistaken. However, it is a satisfactory solution if we suppose that popular opinion, noticing that Baptism was practised by the followers of Jesus, ascribed to the Master what was done by the disciples with His authority. The otherwise curious reluctance of the Apostles to baptize which we see in the Acts is explained if our Lord had never baptized, but had led them to expect a baptism with the Holy Ghost at His hands. Acting on the principle contained in the words, "As the Father hath sent Me, even so I send you,"[3] they represented Christ in mediating the gift of the Holy Ghost, and left to others the work of baptizing which had once been theirs.

---

[1] Swete, *op. cit.* pp. 45, 46.

[2] John iii. 22, iv. 2. John i. 25 bears witness to a popular belief that the Messiah would baptize.

[3] John xx. 21.

(*d*) *The Spirit in St. John.*—In John iii. 5, " Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," *Spirit* may refer to the gift of the Holy Spirit at Confirmation.[1]

There is a good deal of teaching in John xiii-xvii about the Paraclete, but unfortunately it is impossible to use it with confidence until scholarship has reached a measure of agreement as regards the Johannine problem comparable with that which has been reached as regards the Synoptic. Conservative theologians do not doubt the truth of the transcendental teaching contained in these chapters, but they cannot be sure that the truth was not conveyed to the Church after Pentecost.[2]

The same applies to John xx. 22, the meaning of which Dr. Mason discusses in a passage of interest and spiritual beauty.[3] In a sense, it seems to him, this breathing upon the Apostles and their reception of the Holy Ghost must have corresponded to Christian Baptism, which for the first time was possible now the Resurrection had taken place.[4] Dr. Swete[5] suggests that the gift which was potential on Easter night became actual at Pentecost. But Mr. Strachan expresses what is practically a consensus of most recent writers when he says : " Whatever difficulties it may occasion in our minds, there is no doubt that the Evangelist here describes what for him is equivalent to Pentecost. . . . The Cross, Resurrection, Ascension, Pentecost, are all moments in one great event. They are, as it were, telescoped." [6]

(*e*) *Pentecost.*—St. Luke prepares for the narrative of Pentecost by recalling the words of Christ : " Wait for the promise of the Father, which ye heard from Me ; for John indeed baptized with water ; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."[1] In chapter ii we have the actual account of Pentecost, when the disciples received the Holy Ghost, and as an outward sign of the gift the power of ecstatic utterance. After St. Peter's sermon the hearers asked what they must do to be saved, and received the answer: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."[2] They were baptized, to the number of 3,000 souls. "And ye shall receive" as naturally refers to something subsequent to their baptism as to a simultaneous accompaniment of the baptismal rite. No mention is made of laying on of hands, but in the light of other passages in the Acts the writer may well have meant us to assume that Confirmation at the hands of the Apostles followed Baptism at a convenient interval.

---

[1] See Mason, *The Relation of Baptism to Confirmation*, p. 35, for reasons against this interpretation.

[2] If we could be sure what the early Church meant by a " spiritual gospel " we should be near a solution.

[3] *Op. cit.* pp. 468, 469.

[4] *Cf.* 1 Pet. i. 3, iii. 21.

[5] *Op. cit.* p. 167.

[6] *The Fourth Gospel, its Significance and Environment*, p. 228.

This is the first Christian Baptism. The rite taken over from John has been transfigured, and is now "in the name of Jesus Christ." The baptized, so to say, now take an oath of personal allegiance to Him. In the case of the Apostles and others, the relation in which they stood to the Lord, especially during the forty days, may have been considered to convey the essentials of Christian Baptism. For all others, Baptism was henceforward the rule, and John's disciples were rebaptized.[3]

The eschatological motive of the Pentecost story is so strongly marked that we are justified in transferring this aspect of John's baptism to the Christian rite. The washing away of sins in Baptism is the negative essential for entry into the new dispensation. But membership in the Spirit-filled body is not complete until the Spirit has been conferred, either by direct illapse from heaven, or by transference from those who have already received the Spirit. This positive part of the initiatory rite is Confirmation, and with two exceptions all receive Confirmation through the laying on of hands.

The first exception is the case of the Apostles and others in the upper room; the other that of the Gentiles at

---

[1] Acts i. 4, 5. The first part of the quotation recalls John xiv. 16, 26, the latter Luke iii. 16. "Ye shall be baptized" is metaphorical; they were already baptized with water.

[2] Acts ii. 38.

[3] Acts xix. 1-6.

Cæsarea upon whom the Holy Spirit fell.[1] The Jewish Christians were amazed that the phenomena of Pentecost should be repeated.[2] (The incident is sometimes called the Second Pentecost.) The Divine intervention was needed to make plain to the Jews the will of God concerning the Gentiles. St. Peter saw at once the significance of what had happened, and ordered them to be baptized.[3]

IV. Discussion of the Evidence

We have given the evidence in some fulness because no subject can be properly understood in isolation, and Confirmation, in the New Testament, is closely related to Baptism and laying on of hands in Ordination on the one side, and to healing on the other. It remains to sum up the results of the discussion.

We begin with the Old Testament and Jewish background. There are two important factors, the doctrine of the Spirit and the mode by which transference, whether of power or office, was conceived of as taking place. The Spirit of God plays an important part in Old Testament theology, though His personality is not yet fully revealed.[4] The prophets, however, felt sure that a further revelation of the Spirit and His work was in store. The time was coming when God would pour out His Spirit upon all flesh, when the written law would be superseded by a new covenant under which the law would be written inwardly upon men's hearts.[5] Meanwhile, the Spirit was present among God's people, though to a limited extent. Certain classes of men were equipped with the Spirit in a special sense, and were thereby enabled to serve God and His people better. The laying on of hands was a recognized way of transferring this gift of the Spirit. In our Lord's day the prophetic doctrine of the Spirit had probably been pushed into the background, owing to the emphasis laid upon other aspects of the truth, but so long as the Scriptures were studied its revival was an easy matter. The natural result of the return of prophecy in the person of John the Baptist was a renewed emphasis upon the Holy Spirit. This was one of the factors; the other, which was probably not brought into any close relation with the first until Pentecost, was the current conception of the transference of healing power or office through the laying on of hands.

---

[1] Acts x. 44.

[2] Ἐκκέχυται in this special sense is confined in the New Testament to Acts ii. and x.

[3] Note once more the unwillingness of an Apostle to baptize.

[4] Distinctions in the Godhead are clearly taught by the Wisdom-books, but whether "Wisdom" corresponds the closer to the Second or Third Person in Christian thought remains doubtful.

[5] Joel ii. 28; Ezek. xi. 19; Jer. xxxi. 31 ff.

John preached a baptism of repentance, commanding men to be baptized, but insisting that the rite was essentially preparatory. The time was coming when One would baptize them with Spirit and fire, and only those who underwent the purification of water now, betokening an inward change of heart, would receive the Spirit foretold by the prophets in that day.

Such was the preparation, remote and immediate, for our Lord's ministry and its results, regarded as the supreme manifestation of the Spirit. Jesus Himself was conceived by the Holy Ghost and perfectly guided by Him from the dawn of consciousness. But He entered upon the special work of man's salvation for which He had come at the definite date when He went to the Jordan to be baptized by John. Baptism was unnecessary in His case, so far as it symbolized the washing away of sin, but He accepted it because He wished to identify Himself with the needs and cravings of God's people. It was a rite preparatory to the great experience when the Holy Ghost descended in full measure to equip Him for His ministry, an experience which may be termed His Confirmation.

God's Church was now present on earth in the person of One in whom were summed up all the treasures of salvation, bodily and spiritual. The kingdom of God was set up, and with royal bounty the King imparted the blessings of the Messianic time. The touch of Jesus had a sacramental efficacy, and sick and whole alike received blessings from the laying on of His hands. Yet this stage, too, was preparatory to a fuller revelation, when the kingdom of God would no longer be confined to the spot where the earthly body of Jesus was. In view of what was coming He prepared a band of disciples, whose task it would be to spread the kingdom, having first undergone an experience analogous to that of our Lord after His Baptism, a baptism with the Spirit. The great doctrine of the personality of the Holy Ghost began to be revealed in outline—that outline which the Church has been filling in ever since through the guidance of the same Spirit.[1] The disciples were already baptized with water; they were yet to be endued with[2] Divine power descending from the Father, and in a mysterious manner from Jesus Himself.

After the Resurrection the Spirit of Christ was set free from the trammels of an earthly body, and it now became possible for Him to function in the mystical body of His disciples which we call the Church. In that sense the coming of the kingdom of God with power on the Day of Pentecost was a return of Christ.[3] But it was more than that. In Christian belief it was the fullest coming of the Triune God into men's hearts and lives of which it is possible to conceive under earthly conditions. As Jesus was filled with the Holy Ghost after His Baptism, so now was His mystical body to be filled.

The disciples were waiting in the upper room when the Spirit came. According to the fourth Gospel, some of them had received an anticipatory gift of the Spirit before the Ascension; they now received the gift in full.[4] Let us remember how central in their minds was the eschatological motive, the conviction that they were living in the last great days of the dispensation foretold by Joel. They were but the nucleus of the Spirit-filled community which was to be, and, like every living organism, they felt the impulse to expand. They claimed God's promise to pour out His Spirit upon all flesh, and sought new adherents from the outset. By the preaching of St. Peter these were won, and the question at once arose in what manner they were to be admitted into the fellowship of the community. Repentance was an indispensable preliminary, but by what outward act should it be sealed? There could be no hesitation. Some of the Apostles—presumably all—had been baptized by John; the Master Himself had both been baptized and had sanctioned the continuance of the rite. What other method could have occurred to their minds? But on the day of Pentecost the old rite was transfigured and the Christian Sacrament came into being. The kingdom foretold by John had come in its fulness, and the risen Christ was its Lord, to whom the oath of allegiance was taken. The new converts were brought into vital union with Him; they were baptized "in the name of Jesus Christ," into a personal relationship with Jesus, whom they acknowledged to be the Christ. This, it seems, was the historic moment when John's baptism passed into Christian Baptism.

---

[1] *Cf.* Acts i. 4, "wait for the promise of the Father, which ye heard of Me," with John xiv. 16. The Acts passage, which would have received more attention if it had occurred in Luke's earlier work, is independent evidence of the existence of that body of teaching about the Holy Ghost which we find in St. John.

[2] The metaphor suggests "immersed in a stream of."

[3] The relation of this truth to the fuller teaching about the Holy Ghost to which the Church has been led cannot be discussed here. In Rom. viii. 9-11 "the Spirit of God," "the Spirit of Christ," the Christ within, and the Spirit of the Father, are apparently used as interchangeable terms.

[4] While recognizing the force of the argument which identifies the bestowal of the Holy Spirit in John xx with that narrated in Acts ii, I cannot go so far as to accept it. All the 120 (Acts i. 15, ii. 1-4) received the Spirit on the fiftieth day. How did it come to be generally accepted by the time we reach Acts viii that the imparting of the Spirit by the hands of the Apostles only was the natural custom unless there was a tradition of a separate and prior reception of the Spirit by the members of an inner circle?

Now Baptism is, in a sense, the negative side of the act of initiation,[1] as the outward symbolism shows. How was the positive side to be accomplished, and the Spirit already possessed by the nucleus to be imparted to the new adherents? Everything points to the conclusion that the Apostles, in all the fulness of their Pentecostal inspiration, took a vital decision, and then and there instituted the rite which we call Confirmation as the necessary and positive complement to the baptismal washing away of sins. Whether they had received instruction to this effect during the forty days or whether the risen Christ in their midst led them to the decision we cannot tell—perhaps they themselves would have seen no essential difference between the two. In the light of their Jewish upbringing, the religious practice of the day, and the example of Christ, we can see no method likely to occur to their minds as the normal channel by which the Spirit should be transferred other than the laying on of hands. So far as the evidence goes, it points to this being the universal practice in the apostolic age, except when, as at Cæsarea, God made it clear by unmistakable signs that the gift had already been bestowed. To suppose, as some do, that the laying on of hands in Acts viii was an innovation is quite gratuitous; there is no hint of such a thing in St. Luke's narrative. Until evidence to the contrary is produced, we shall believe that the first Confirmation took place, not at Samaria, but at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and that it was conducted by the twelve Apostles. We are not told in so many words that the administration of the rite was confined to the Apostles and those to whom they delegated their authority, but it is highly probable. There is no evidence to show that anyone else confirmed.[1] We rely mainly on the Acts for our knowledge of Confirmation in the apostolic age, but St. Luke's evidence is corroborated by the Epistles, in which we find constant references to a definite act by which the Spirit was conferred. If these stood alone, we should take them of Baptism; as it is, they fall into line with the other evidence, and are seen to refer to the second part of the initiatory act.

---

[1] We must not press this thought too far; entry into the community, especially on the part of one who has reached years of discretion, is a positive act in the highest degree.

While the fundamental meaning of the laying on of hands appears most plainly in Confirmation, which applies to all Christians, a specialized form[2] of Confirmation was speedily developed in Ordination, and the Apostles, like our Lord, wrought miracles of healing by this means.

Details in the foregoing pages are doubtless open to criticism, but the main thesis will not be challenged seriously unless from two quarters. There are those who feel bound to defend the existence of Confirmation as a separate Sacrament with graces of its own. That the two Sacraments are separate theoretically in that they represent the negative and positive sides of Christian initiation, we have already shown. Nor will anyone deny the part played by the Holy Ghost in Baptism. The start of the new life in the Church must be His work; besides, whatever is done in the souls of men by the Father or the Son is done through the Holy Ghost. Nevertheless, the unity of Baptism and Confirmation is more fundamental than their distinction. To us in the Western Church they inevitably appear as two; but they are two flowers growing out of a single root.

---

[1] For Ananias in Acts ix see p. 6.

[2] The outward sign is the same, the Spirit is given in both cases; the difference lies in the purpose for which the gift is bestowed.

The other ground on which our conclusions will be challenged is that they are based on the untenable hypothesis of the historical accuracy of the Acts. For example, much modern criticism dismisses the story of Pentecost as largely legendary, or weakens the value of Acts viii by dissecting it into earlier and later sections. Here we part company with scholars to whom in other respects we owe a great debt. We hold that the Acts comes through the crucible of criticism in all essentials unaltered. The arguments for the Lukan authorship are so strong as to make the contrary thesis an intellectual *tour de force.* The book is an obvious unity, and dates from a time about the death of St. Paul, or not long after. Impugners of its historicity pay insufficient heed, it would seem, to the conditions under which a small and vigorous religious community develops. It is incredible that Christians in the third quarter of the first century did not know the main facts of their early history. As we learn from St. Paul's Epistles, the local Churches were kept in close touch with one another by an elaborate system of letters and messengers. Communications were easier and surer than in any subsequent century up to the nineteenth. Is it probable that a community in which the spirit of criticism was evidently so much alive—to judge from St. Paul's Epistles—would have accepted an account of Christian origins which scores of other disciples, if not a surviving Apostle, could have shown in a minute to be largely untrue?

We have only to transfer the events to our own day to get a right perspective. Would a history of the foundation of the Salvation Army which was radically wrong have any chance of being accepted by the rank and file of that body? If there were any real divergence between the Acts and the Epistles of St. Paul, then the value of the former would be gravely shaken. But the discrepancies are small; one can imagine a score of facts unknown to us which would explain them,[1] and with a little—a very little—easing of the joins they can be reconciled. Reject the Acts if you feel you must, but realize how far your rejection takes you. It lands you in a radical scepticism as regards the whole of Christian origins. When you reject the evidence in favour of Confirmation, much on which you are relying for your scheme of Christianity gives way under your feet.

[Note.—This chapter appeared originally as articles in the magazine *Theology*. It was criticized by Dr. J. M. Harden in *The Churchman* of April 1922. (Art.: "A Modern Theory about Confirmation.") The position advocated here is described as a "theory which is fashionable to-day with a certain section of Anglo-Catholic theologians" and is said to be "of comparatively recent growth in the Anglican Church." "The position of the Evangelical School . . . is closer to that of the Church of Rome than is the position of these writers." Dr. Harden's own theory is that the laying on of hands in the Acts conferred miraculous Pentecostal gifts, that the earlier practice ceased, and that "Confirmation" originated later and was unconnected with anything described in the Acts.]

---

[1] The same applies to a number of questions which might be asked: Who confirmed at Antioch before Barnabas went there? Who confirmed in St. Paul's absence in his widespread missions? Did Philip start out on a missionary tour knowing that he would have to omit an integral part of the initiatory ceremony? We are not arguing for any uniformity in these early days, but that the mind of the Church was as stated, and that the principle was put into practice as rapidly as circumstances allowed.

CHAPTER II

THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF CONFIRMATION IN THE CHURCH UP TO THE REFORMATION

By A. J. Maclean

SUMMARY

1. Scope of this Essay.
2. Names of Confirmation.
3. Unction.
4. Consecration of the Chrism and of the Oil.
5. Imposition of the Hand.
6. Confirmation and the Reception of Heretics.
7. Theological Significance of Unction and Imposition of the Hand.
8. Separation of Confirmation from Baptism. Age of Confirmation.
9. Minister of Confirmation.
10. Confirmation and First Communion.

1. Scope of this Essay

The object of this essay is to consider the use of Confirmation from the end of the apostolic period till the Reformation. The laying on of hands in the New Testament has already been treated in a previous essay, and it is only necessary here to say that, at least normally, the Apostles, St. Paul as well as the Twelve, made use of an act complementary to immersion, and specially connected with the gift of the Holy Ghost. The Church followed the apostolic example in different ways. There was always the complementary act, but usage varied as to its nature. Unction was in general use, as it would appear, at least from the middle of the second century to the Reformation; and laying on of the hand was common, though in some parts of the Church it disappeared or was little emphasized. The theological significance of the different parts of the rite of Christian initiation was conceived variously, and the formularies used (which will be dealt with in another essay) differed greatly.

Some misconception of the evidence will be saved if we remember that in ancient Christian writers the name "baptism" is frequently used for the complete rite of initiation, not only for the immersion (as we may call it, whether it was total or partial), but for that complement of immersion which we call "confirmation." Hence we must be on our guard against equating "baptism" in all cases with "immersion"; and to discuss, for example, whether a particular case of unction belongs more properly to the immersion or to confirmation seems scarcely profitable. The rite is one.[1]

In this essay the ceremonies in connexion with the catechumenate and the immersion are omitted, save that the various anointings connected with the baptismal rite are, for a special reason, discussed fully.

The evidence adduced scarcely begins before the last quarter of the second century. The scanty remains of the sub-apostolic period do not contain any explicit mention of Confirmation. Justin,[2] indeed, speaks of the special prayer for the "illuminated" (the baptized) between the immersion and the kiss of peace and communion, and this may refer to it. But when the literature becomes abundant the language used shows that a complement to immersion had been of long standing in the Church; such as that of Irenæus and Hippolytus, who say that the Gnostics used unction in their parody of Baptism, and that of Tertullian, who traces the unction of Confirmation back to the "old discipline" of anointing to the priesthood; it was no novelty in his day, and from it our Lord was named "Christ."[3]

2. Names of Confirmation

No special name was needed so long as Confirmation and immersion were not separated. The use of "confirmatio" and "confirmare" in the technical sense probably dates from the fifth century, and is only Western. It is found in Leo the Great,[1] with reference to the reception of heretics.[2] On the other hand, "confirmare" means "to administer the chalice to" in the *Ordines Romani*,[3] Amalarius of Metz, and Rabanus Maurus[4] (both of the ninth century), and probably in the *Gregorian Sacramentary*.[5] Alcuin[6] (Albinus Flaccus, A.D. 735-804) uses it of administering in both kinds.

---

[1] See below, § 8.

[2] *Apol.* i. 65.

[3] For these writers see below, § 3.

A more common name (especially for the rite of Christian initiation as a whole) is "the seal" (σφραγίς, *signaculum*). This is the ordinary Eastern designation. It is used in the second century by Hermas[7] explicitly of the water, and in an ancient Homily of Baptism generally.[8] Basil, in the fourth century, calls Baptism as a whole "the seal,"[9] as do the *Apostolic Constitutions*[10] and the parallel *Older Didascalia*[11] (third century); perhaps also the *Apostolic Church Order*[12] (*c.* A.D. 300). But it is used especially of Confirmation elsewhere in the *Apostolic Constitutions*,[13] as also, probably, by Cyril of Jerusalem.[1] Pope Cornelius (A.D. 251-252) uses σφραγισθῆναι of Confirmation as distinguished from the immersion.[2]

---

[1] *Ep.* clix. 8, ad Nic.

[2] For other instances more applicable to the normal rite of "confirmation" see Hastings, *Encycl. of Rel. and Ethics*, IV. 1*a*. The title of can. 77 of Elvira (Illiberis) in S. Spain (*c.* A.D. 305), which has "nondum confirmati," is only that of J. D. Mansi's index; it is not in the body of his work (*Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio*, Florence and Venice, 1759-98). In the *Apost. Const.* βεβαίωσις is used, but not in a technical sense (iii. 17; see below, § 7, p. 48).

[3] See *e.g. Ord. Rom. Prim.*, ed. E. G. C. Atchley, London, 1905, p. 142 (8th cent. ?)

[4] C. D. Ducange, *Glossarium Mediæ et Infimæ Latinitatis* (Paris, 1840-50, s.v.).

[5] See below, § 3 (*c*), p. 38.

[6] *Ep.* xc.; M. Hittorp, *De divinis Cath. Eccles. Officiis*, Cologne, 1568, p. 100 *b* (see below, § 10). This is the reference for all the quotations from Alcuin in this essay, unless it is otherwise stated.

[7] *Sim.* ix. 16.

[8] Ps.-Clem. Rom. 2 *Cor.* 7 f., "keep the seal"; *cf.* Tertullian, *de Præscr.* 36: "She [the Church] seals [her faith] with the water."

[9] "They that were sealed by the Spirit" (*de Spir. S.* xvi [40], etc.).

[10] ii. 39, iii. 16; see below, § 3 (*c*), p. 34 for the date.

[11] F. X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, Paderborn, 1905, i. 126.

[12] § 12; see *Journ. of Theol. Stud.* iii. 65. Not in the parallel *Didache*.

[13] iii. 17 (not in the parallel *Older Didascalia*); vii. 22 (as distinguished from immersion; not in the parallel *Didache*).

Other common names for Confirmation are "chrisma," "perfectio" (τελείωσις),[3] and "the laying on of the hand [or hands]."[4]

3. UNCTION

From at least sub-apostolic times onwards unction is almost universal in connexion with Baptism. In most cases a distinction is made between simple olive-oil and unguent ("chrism," μύρον), which was oil mixed with fragrant substances. Where there was more than one anointing, oil was usually employed before immersion, chrism after. But there are some exceptions, and in the early Syrian Church, and perhaps elsewhere in the earliest periods, there was no particular distinction between the two. Thus, for example, in Theodoret[5] we read of "the chrism of μύρον" being used immediately after the "renunciation of the tyrant"—that is, before immersion.

It is disputed whether unction was used in apostolic times in connexion with Baptism. The Apostles certainly anointed, and in the New Testament unction is used as an alternative to the laying on of hands in the case of the sick and blind.[1] The only question is whether unction was then used in connexion with Baptism. The references to anointing in 2 Cor. i. 21 f., 1 John ii. 20, 27, may be figurative only, but the figure would be much more telling if unction was in use as an outward and visible sign in baptism. Dr. F. Chase, the late Bishop of Ely, thinks it probable that it was so.[2] Tertullian is more emphatic on the same side.[3] Against this is the fact that St. Luke does not mention it, though he twice describes a Confirmation.[4] Possibly unction was used in some places, but not in others. It is also possible, however, that the custom of anointing at Baptism arose in sub-apostolic times, being due to a literal interpretation of the metaphorical language of the New Testament on the subject; it is noticeable that it is not found in the *Didache* (*c.* A.D. 120).

---

[1] *Cat.* iii. 3; A.D. 348.

[2] Eusebius, *H.E.* vi. 43. There are several other uses of the name "seal." It is used for any sign of the cross in Cyr. Jer. *Cat.* xiii. 36; of the signing of the *competentes* (selected candidates) before Baptism in the *Testament of our Lord* (ii. 7; *c.* A.D. 350 ?), the *Canons of Hippolytus* (can. xix [110]), and the Sahidic (not the Ethiopic) version of Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* (the *Egyptian Church Order*, § 45; see below, p. 29); of the presbyters laying on hands at a presbyter's ordination in the Latin (not the Ethiopic) version of the same (ed. E. Hauler, *Didasc. Apost. Fragmenta Ueronensia Latina*, Leipzig, 1900, p. 110); of admission to the Eleusinian Mysteries in Tertullian (*adv. Valent.* 1); of the conclusion of a service in the *Test. of our Lord* (i. 26), and so among the East Syrians now; of the eucharistic bread (F. E. Brightman, *Lit. E. and W.*, Oxford, 1896, p. 587); of the liturgical gospel as the "sealer" of the lections in the *Edessene Canons* (§ 8: 4th cent.; *Ante-Nic. Chr. Lib.* xx. pt. 2, p. 40, Edinburgh, 1871); and of the kiss of peace as the seal of prayer in Tertullian (*de Orat.* 18).

[3] *Cf.* Elvira can. 77 ("per benedictionem perficere debebit"), and below, § 7 (*c*).

[4] *Cf.* Heb. vi. 2.

[5] *in Cant.* i. 2.

In the latter half of the second century Irenæus, speaking of the Gnostic Marcosians and their parody of Christian Baptism, tells us that they anointed with balsam after immersion.[5] He does not actually say if unction was used in the Church. He mentions that some Gnostics thought it superfluous to bring persons to the water, but mixing oil and water poured it on the head, and then (?) anointed with balsam; this is perhaps an early example of hallowing the water by pouring in oil,[6] and of baptism by affusion. Hippolytus,[7] speaking of the Naasenes' "baptism," mentions water and the chrism.

It has been suggested that until the fourth century there was only one anointing.[8] In view, however, of Dom R. Connolly's discovery (now generally accepted) that the "*Egyptian Church Order*" dates back in the main to Hippolytus,[9] and is to be identified with that

---

[1] Mark vi. 13 (*cf.* v. 23, vi. 5, vii. 32), viii. 23 (πτύσας, *cf.* viii. 25); John ix. 6, 11; Jas. v. 14; Rev. iii. 18. *Cf.* Acts xxviii. 8.

[2] *Confirmation in the Apostolic Age*, London, 1909, p. 59.

[3] *de Bapt.* 7; see above, § 1.

[4] Acts viii. 14 ff., xix. 2 ff.

[5] *Hær.* I. xxi. 3 f.

[6] See below, (*c*), note, p. 39.

[7] *Ref.* v. 2 (early 3rd cent.).

[8] T. Thompson, *Offices of Bapt. and Conf.*, Cambridge, 1914, p. 32 (a most valuable compendium).

[9] *The So-called Egyptian Church Order*, Cambridge, 1916. Some features in at least the Sahidic and Ethiopic versions must be additions of the fourth century.

Father's *Apostolic Tradition*, this statement must be modified, for there, in all its three principal versions, Latin, Sahidic, and Ethiopic (the original Greek is lost), we have more than one anointing. The other earlier authorities mention only one, some after immersion, some before.

(*a*) *After Immersion.*—At the end of the second century Tertullian gives[1] the order of the ceremonies as immersion—unction—laying on of the hand.[2] In the water, he says, we are "prepared for the Holy Ghost"; "we do not obtain (*consequamur*)" the Spirit "in the waters." He perhaps implies a copious anointing all over the body (*perungimur*). The imposition of the hand is for receiving the Spirit, the unction is a consecration. After becoming a Montanist he uses similar language,[3] showing that his new co-religionists did not differ from the Catholics as to Confirmation. Here the order is washing—anointing (for consecration)—signing (for strengthening)—imposition of the hand (for the gift of the Spirit)—eucharist. No hint is given that these acts could be separated. In Tertullian's Treatise against Marcion[4] the unction is with oil. About the same time Clement of Alexandria distinguishes Confirmation from immersion and probably refers to unction.[5] In the story of the young robber[6] he says that the bishop (here called "the presbyter") "enlightened" (baptized) the youth, and set on him the seal of the Lord; elsewhere[7] he remarks that if a man is a mere animal baptism is not rational, nor is the blessed seal. Unction is also mentioned by Theophilus of Antioch[8] as being the reason of the name "Christian"; this implies that he believed the Apostles to have used it.

In the third century Cyprian lays more stress on the laying on of the hand than on the unction, which he mentions only once[1]; the oil is consecrated on the altar. The writer of the tract *de Rebaptismate*, who was perhaps an Italian bishop of the third century, and who adopts Pope Stephen's attitude in his controversy with the Africans,[2] does not mention unction at all. Origen mentions it but twice.[3] The Novatians are said by Theodoret[4] not to have used unction in baptism, and Cornelius affirms that Novatian was clinically baptized[5] and not confirmed: he never obtained the other things necessary, and was not "sealed by the bishop," and so could not have obtained the Holy Ghost.[6] Novatian himself, speaking of baptism, dwells on the Holy Ghost's effecting regeneration with water, but does not mention the seal.[7]

---

[1] *de Bapt.* 6-8.

[2] Singular; see below, § 5, p. 41.

[3] *de Res. Carn.* 8.

[4] i. 14.

[5] Explicitly so in one reading of *Strom.* vii. 7.

[6] *Quis Dives*, 42; here "enlightening" probably includes the whole rite.

[7] *Strom.* ii. 3.

[8] *ad Autol.* i. 12; *c.* A.D. 180. He neither mentions nor negatives the laying on of the hand; he is not describing the baptismal rites in detail.

In the fourth century Optatus of Milevis, in Numidia, mentions unction before the laying on of the hand[8]; the former prepares for the Holy Ghost, a phrase which recalls that of Tertullian cited above.

(*b*) *Before Immersion.*—It was a peculiarity of the early Syrian Church that the complement of immersion, which in that case was unction only, preceded the action at the font, and that there was no anointing afterwards. It is clear that this pre-baptismal unction took the place of Confirmation, and to it was ascribed the gift of the Holy Ghost. Narsai[9] seems to call it the "drug of the Spirit," and certainly says that the Spirit is given by it; Ephraim[10] calls it "the seal." A later relic of this custom is seen in the

---

[1] *Ep.* lxx. [lxix] 2. The numbers of Cyprian's Epistles given in brackets are those of the *Ante-Nicene Chr. Library*, Edinburgh, 1870. Migne's numbers from xxiii onwards are one more than these.

[2] See below, § 6.

[3] *Hom. in Lev.* t. vi., § 5 ("unctio chrismatis"); *in Rom.* t. v., § 8 (these two passages survive in Latin only).

[4] *Hær. Fab. Compend.* iii. 5; see below, § 6, p. 45.

[5] See below, § 8 (*b*), p. 53.

[6] Eusebius, *H.E.* vi. 43. Like most Greek Fathers, Eusebius calls him "Novatus."

[7] *de Trin.* 29.

[8] *de Schism. Donat.* iv. 7, vii. 4.

[9] R. H. Connolly, *Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, Cambridge, 1909, pp. 43, 45.

[10] *Epiphany Hymns*, iii. (*Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, Oxford, 1898), xiii. 269 ff.

West Syrian (Jacobite) formula used at the anointing before immersion: "Send Thy Holy Spirit on them who are to be baptized."[1] The Syrians might have appealed to the case of Cornelius, on whom the Holy Ghost fell before baptism; but the surprise of St. Peter[2] negatives the idea that in the New Testament it was not uncommon for the Confirmation to precede immersion. In Cornelius's case there was an exceptional manifestation.

The evidence of this Syrian peculiarity is now considerable. It is found in the *Older Didascalia*, a Syrian work of the third century, originally written in Greek[3]; the bishop, "in the laying on of the hand," anoints the head, "as priests and kings in Israel were anointed," and then he baptizes or commissions the presbyter and deacons to do so; there is no post-baptismal unction. This single anointing before immersion is also found in the Greek *Clementine Recognitions*,[4] which in its present form is deemed to be of the fourth century, though the story and probably most of the details are much older. So in the Gnostic *Acts of Judas Thomas*,[5] a third-century work originally written in Syriac,[6] we find a blessing of the oil, anointing of the head, immersion, eucharist; the anointing is called "the seal" (rūshmā). The *Acts of John the Son of Zebedee*,[7] which were probably written originally in Syriac,[8] give similar evidence. Ephraim, in the fourth century, speaks of unction only as administered before immersion.[1] He says: "When the leper of old was cleansed, the priest used to seal him with oil and to lead him to the water-spring . . . With chrism ye have been sealed, in baptism ye are perfected, in the flock ye are intermingled, from the body ye are nourished."[2] There is, however, in one of the commentaries ascribed to Ephraim[3] a reference to unction after immersion: "Oil . . . with which those who have been baptized ('*mīdhé*')[4] are sealed and put on the armour of the Holy Ghost." But this work is probably not Ephraim's. These commentaries are really the Severus-catena, notes on the Old Testament, many by Jacob of Edessa, some headed "Of Ephraim," though the heading is often doubtful and the extracts may be paraphrases rather than quotations. We cannot, therefore, accept them as Ephraim's at any point where they disagree with attested sayings of that Father.[5]

---

[1] H. Denzinger, *Ritus Orientalium*, Würzburg, 1863, i. 273.

[2] Acts x. 47.

[3] iii. 12, Funk, i. 210; see below, § 5, for the laying on of the hand in this passage. Curiously enough, in ii. 33 (Funk, i. 116) the order is reversed: "bishops . . . who regenerated you through water, who filled you with the Holy Ghost."

[4] iii. 67. This work now exists only in a Latin translation. The parallel *Clementine Homilies* (iii. 73) do not describe the baptism. At that of Mattidia, Clement's mother, in *Clem. Recog.* vii. 38, *Clem. Hom.* xiv. 1, no anointing is mentioned, nor yet in the older *Life of Clement* (Syriac); but there the baptism is not described in detail (A. Mingana, *Some Early Judaeo-Christian Documents*, Manchester, 1917).

[5] Given in W. Wright's *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, 1871. See ii. 116, 188, 258, 267, 289. Also in *Ante-Nic. Chr. Lib.* xvi. 389 (another form); here the anointing is mentioned, not the immersion, and the whole rite is called "the seal."

[6] F. C. Burkitt in *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, i. 280, iii. 94.

[7] Wright, ii. 38 ff., 53 ff.

[8] Connolly in *Journ. of Theol. Stud.* viii. 249.

Other early Syrian evidence is to the same effect. In Aphraates (Aphrahat), the Persian sage of the fourth century, the only anointing alluded to is before baptism.[6] So in the *Life of Rabbula*, who was Bishop of Edessa A.D. 411-435, we read that the priests "anointed and baptized him"[7]; the baptism was in the Jordan, whither Rabbula had made a pilgrimage; but the writer doubtless describes what was familiar to himself. In the Syriac *Baptism of Constantine*,[8] *c.* A.D. 500, the order is unction—immersion—communion. In Narsai, about that date, only one anointing is mentioned, and Dom Connolly shows that it was pre-baptismal.[9] The East Syrians maintained this custom until the Catholicos Ishūʻyahbh III (A.D. 647-658), who was a traveller and had seen Roman and Greek rites, added post-baptismal unction,[10] and to this day anointing after baptism is not explicitly mentioned in their best manuscripts, though it is usual in practice to dip the thumb in oil when signing. Severus, Patriarch of Antioch A.D. 512-519, probably introduced it among the West Syrians.

---

[1] *Epiphany Hymns*, iii. iv.
[2] iii. 17.
[3] *in Ioel*, ii.
[4] This cannot mean "baptizandi," as Dr. Lawlor suggests (Hastings, *Encycl. of Religion and Ethics*, iv. 3 *a*).
[5] I owe these suggestions to Dr. Burkitt.
[6] *Dem.* 12.
[7] C. Brocklemann, *Syr. Chrestomathia* (pt. 2 of *Syr. Grammatik*), Berlin, 1905, p. 74*; Overbeck, *S. Ephr. Syr. Selecta Opera*, p. 165.
[8] Overbeck, p. 355.
[9] *Lit. Hom. of Narsai*, p. xlvi.
[10] *Ibid.* p. xlix.

It has been suggested that Chrysostom hints at this custom as obtaining in the Syriac-speaking Church of his day, when he says that Cornelius received the Spirit before baptism, and "this has come to pass until (?) our own day" (ἐφ' ἡμᾶς)[1]; but this is doubtful, for Chrysostom seems to put the words into the mouth of St. Peter. For Theodoret's evidence see above, p. 28.

(*c*) *Two or more Unctions.*—This probably is first found in Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* (the "*Egyptian Church Order*"), mentioned above. There we have a pre-baptismal anointing with "oil of exorcism" (the Latin is wanting here), and a second anointing after immersion by the presbyter with another consecrated oil, called the "oil of thanksgiving" (Ethiop. "mystic oil," Lat. "consecrated oil"), and a third by the bishop, with the second oil, at the laying on of the hand (the Latin also has these unctions). The derived Church Orders, probably of the fourth century, the *Testament of our Lord*,[2] and the *Canons of Hippolytus*[3] have the same arrangement, except that in the latter no unction by the bishop is mentioned, unless the signing be with the thumb dipped in chrism. In Cyril of Jerusalem there are two unctions; first the whole body is anointed with exorcized oil before immersion, then, after immersion, the brows, ears, nostrils, and breast are anointed with chrism.[4] In Cyril, as in the above-mentioned Church Orders, exorcizing power is attributed to the earlier unction. The *Apostolic Constitutions*, a Syrian work,[5] which adopts the *Didache*, the *Older Didascalia*, and other sources, adds two anointings to the *Didache* (which has none), one with oil (not specially named) before immersion, and one after with unguent (μύρον)[1]; and one anointing, after immersion, to the *Didascalia*.[2] In vii. 42, 44, which is of unknown origin, there are two unctions, one before and one after immersion. So in ii. 32 we read "sealed with the oil of gladness and the unguent of understanding," while the *Older Didascalia* has only "sealed."[3] Some stress is laid on the second unction, though the writer says that if there is no oil nor unguent, water alone may be used.[4]

---

[1] *in Act.* Hom. xxiv (on chap. x).

[2] ii. 8 f.

[3] Can. xix [120, 134, 139]. The numbers in brackets are those of the sections in H. Achelis, *Die Can. Hipp.*, Leipzig, 1891. The latest writers date these canons not before the fourth century.

[4] *Cat.* xx. [*Myst.* ii] 3, xxi. [*Myst.* iii] 4.

[5] The date, *c.* A.D. 375, is arrived at by comparing the festal cycle with the notices of feasts in Chrysostom's works, and by other indications.

In the Sacramentary of Sarapion, Bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, and friend of Athanasius (*c.* A.D. 350), there are two blessings of oils,[5] for use before and after immersion, the former oil being called ἄλειμμα, the latter χρῖσμα. With the latter the gift of the Holy Spirit is associated.

The North Italian writer of the *de Sacramentis* (*c.* A.D. 400 ?), who professes to follow in the main the customs of Rome,[6] mentions unction before and after immersion.[7] The Council of Laodicea in Phrygia orders[8] that "those who are being illuminated are to be anointed after baptism with the heavenly chrism, and to be partakers of the kingdom of Christ" (the Eucharist ?); this seems to point to the fact that some people followed the older Syrian custom and omitted the second unction.

In an abbreviated Coptic office,[9] which shows a desire to assimilate to Holy Scripture, confirmation is by imposition of hands (plural) and invocation of the Holy Ghost without anointing. And in Ireland in the eleventh and twelfth centuries unction was occasionally omitted.[10]

The rites, as we have seen, do not all agree as to the number of anointings and as to their place in the service. In the West, if there was more than one unction after immersion, the presbyter usually administered the first, the bishop always the second.

---

[1] vii. 22. [2] iii. 16. [3] Funk, i. 114 f. [4] vii. 22.

[5] § 15 f.; for the Greek text see F. E. Brightman in *Journ. of Theol. Stud.* i. 88, 247.

[6] iii. 1[5]; Dr. Bannister ascribes this work to the sixth century (*Miss. Goth.*, H.B.S., London, 1919, ii. 62); Mr. Scudamore, with little probability, to the eighth (*Dict. of Chr. Ant.* ii. 2000 *b*).

[7] i. 2[4]; iii. 1[1]; iv. 1[3]. [8] Can. 48; *c.* A.D. 380.

[9] Denzinger, i. 233; it seems not to have been in use.

[10] F. E. Warren, *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, Oxford, 1881, p. 65.

In the following authorities, besides those already noticed, anointing before immersion is mentioned: the *de Sacramentis* as above, but not the parallel *de Mysteriis*, which is certainly by Ambrose; John the Deacon[1] (of Rome), *c.* A.D. 500; Chrysostom[2]; Gregory the Great,[3] A.D. 590-604 (but, it seems, not ordinarily in the *Gregorian Sacramentary*,[4] which, though later than Gregory, probably preserves usages of a time earlier than itself); Alcuin; the *Missale Bobbiense*, called by J. M. Neale and G. Forbes[5] *Miss. Vesontionense* ("of Besançon"); the *Stowe Missal*[6]; the *Ordo Romanus* given by Hittorp[7]; Amalarius[8]; Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita[9]; the developed Coptic, West Syrian, Maronite, and East Syrian rites[10]; the Roman and Sarum rites[11]; the Greek rite, as given in the *Barbarini Euchologion*[12] and in the present use.[13] See also below, the note on the Effeta. The pre-baptismal unction is not found in the present Armenian rite,[14] but perhaps it was there originally,[15] for the presbyter consecrates the oil before immersion, while the oil used after immersion has already been consecrated by the catholicos; there is no distinction in this rite between "oil" and "chrism."

Sometimes there was one unction after immersion, sometimes (as in most Roman authorities) two; Dr.

---

[1] *Ep. ad Senarium* 8, in J. Mabillon's *Musæum Italicum*, Paris, 1687, i. pt. 2, p. 73.

[2] *Hom.* vi. *in Coloss.* § 4 (on Col. ii. 15).

[3] *Ep.* iv. 9, ad Januarium.

[4] Ed. Wilson, p. 54 ff.; but the anointing after the Effeta (see below) may take the place of the pre-baptismal unction. In clinical baptism there is a pre-baptismal anointing (Wilson, p. 137).

[5] *Ancient Lit. of the Gallican Church*, Burntisland, 1855, 1867, p. 269.

[6] Warren, p. 212.

[7] p. 67 (called by Mabillon, ii, p. ix, "a farrago of diverse rites according to various uses").

[8] *de Eccl. Off.* i. 23.

[9] *de Eccl. Hier.* ii. 6 f.

[10] Denzinger, i. 195, 273, 341, 355, 358, 374.

[11] For the Sarum rite see W. Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia Eccl. Angl.*, London, 1846, i. 22.

[12] F. C. Conybeare, *Rituale Armenorum*, Oxford, 1905, p. 404 (8th cent.).

[13] R. F. Littledale, *Offices of the Holy East. Ch.*, London, 1863, p. 25.

[14] *Rit. Arm.* p. 93.

[15] Denzinger, i. 35.

Lawlor suggests[1] that this was due to the mingling of Roman and Gallican customs by Pope Innocent I (A.D. 402-417), who allowed presbyters to anoint after baptism (with chrism consecrated by the bishop), but retained the bishop's chrismation. In other authorities there is usually only one post-baptismal unction, and this is the natural result when presbyters are allowed to confirm. In the following list the figures denote the number of post-baptismal anointings, including signing with oil: Innocent I (2, permissively); John the Deacon (1); the *Gelasian Sacramentary*[2] (1); *Ordo Romanus* vii[3] (2): *de Mysteriis* and *de Sacramentis* (2 ?), but in the later Milanese and Spanish rites only one[4]; the *Missale Gothicum*[5] (1); the *Miss. Gallicanum Vetus*[6] (1); the *Bobbio Missal* (2 ?), where the anointing is by the presbyter, but no action or prayer by the bishop is mentioned; Gregory the Great[7] (1); Amalarius of Metz[8] (2); the developed Roman and Sarum rites (2), where the two offices of Baptism and Confirmation are disjoined[9]; and in the East, Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita[10] (1), who mentions the anointing by the "hierarch" with unguent (*μύρον*), and the Maronite rite (2), which shows Roman influence.[11] For the East Syrian custom see above (*b*). The Copts and Armenians anoint the brow, eyes, etc., with separate formulas after immersion, the Greeks and West Syrians anoint separately but with one formula.[12]

---

[1] Hastings, *Encycl. of Rel. and Eth.* iv. 7 *b*. The reference to Innocent is *Ep. ad Decent.* 3 (Mansi, iii. 1028 ff.); but some dispute the authenticity of this epistle.

[2] The *Gelasian Sacramentary* (7th cent. ?) has been edited by H. A. Wilson (Oxford, 1894), the *Leonine* (6th cent. ?) by C. L. Feltoe (Cambridge, 1896), the *Gregorian* by H. A. Wilson (H. Bradshaw Soc. [H.B.S.], London, 1915); all three (with the *Miss. Goth.*, *Miss. Francorum*, etc.), by L. A. Muratori, *Lit. Romana*, Venice, 1748.

[3] Mabillon, ii. 77 ff.; so Hittorp, pt. i. p. 75.

[4] Thompson, p. 241 f.; see *de Myst.* vi [29, 42].

[5] Ed. H. M. Bannister (H.B.S. 1917), p. 77.

[6] Mabillon, i. 324.

[7] *Ep.* iv. 9, ad Jan.

[8] *de Eccl. Off.* i. 27; 9th cent.

[9] Maskell, i. 24, 35.

[10] *de Eccl. Hier.* ii. 7.

[11] Thompson, p. 65. In Denzinger, i. 349, the priest signs with chrism after immersion, and then immediately anoints the whole body.

[12] *Rit. Arm.* pp. 98, 405; Denzinger, i. 209, 278, 389.

The *Gregorian Sacramentary* has a point which requires consideration. It describes both public and clinical baptism.[1] In the former the presbyter anoints after immersion, and then the prayer for the sevenfold gifts of the Spirit is given, but no more is said; yet the prayer is probably intended to be offered, as in the *Ordines Romani*, by the bishop, who apparently is meant to sign the forehead with chrism. In the clinical baptism we find this direction to the presbyter after the immersion and anointing: "Communicas et confirmas eum." This is almost certainly not a direction to the presbyter to confirm in the modern sense,[2] but "confirmare" here means "to deliver the chalice to."[3] If the sick man recovered he would be brought to the bishop to be confirmed; but in any case the first communion of the sick would precede confirmation. This is clearly contemplated in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*.[4]

At a later period we find directions for the children (*parvuli*) who have been confirmed to be taken to the church on the third day to have the chrism washed from their foreheads, and for the *chrismalia* (linen bands tied round the brow) to be burnt.[5]

For the significance of the anointings, see below, § 7.[6]

---

[1] Ed. Wilson, pp. 57, 137.

[2] See below, § 9.

[3] See above, § 2.

[4] Ed. Wilson, p. 117.

[5] As at Oxford, A.D. 1222 (D. Wilkins, *Concilia Magn. Brit. et Hib.*, London, 1737, i. 594, *cf.* p. 657) and Exeter, A.D. 1287 (*ibid.* ii. 132).

[6] Three other uses of oil may be mentioned, two of them perhaps having some analogy with the Syrian custom described above (*b*). (i) For the *Effeta*, or touching the ears and nose with this Syriac word (Ephphatha, "be thou opened"), a ceremony called in Spain *effetatio*, oil was originally used; see John the Deacon, § 4, Ildephonsus, Bishop of Toledo A.D. 657-667, *de Cogn. Bapt.* i. 27 f. (in S. Baluze's *Miscellanea*, Lucæ, 1761-4, vol. ii). Later, saliva was used (*Gelas. Sacr.* ed. Wilson, p. 114, *Ord. Rom.* vii, § 9, and later Western pontificals). But in Ambrose (*de Myst.* i [3]), the *Bobbio Missal* (Neale and Forbes, p. 269), the *Stowe Missal* (Warren, p. 210), Alcuin, and Amalarius (*de Eccl. Off.* i. 23, Hittorp, p. 136 *a*), neither saliva nor oil are mentioned at the Effeta itself. In *Greg. Sacr.* (ed. Wilson, p. 54), *Ord. Rom.* i (§ 37, Mabillon ii. 24), the *Stowe Missal*, *Gelas. Sacr.*, Alcuin, Amalarius, etc., the Effeta takes place just before the anointing of shoulders and breast. At Rome it took place originally on some day in Lent (John the Deacon), but in *Greg. Sacr.* on Easter Even, in Spain on Palm Sunday (Thompson, p. 143). In the *de Sacramentis* (i. 1[2]) the bishop (*sacerdos*)

4. Consecration of the Chrism and of the Oil

The ordinary rule was that chrism should be consecrated by the bishop, or in the East usually by the patriarch, on Maundy Thursday, as for example in the *Gregorian*[1] and *Gelasian*[2] *Sacramentaries*, the *Canterbury Benedictional*,[3] and the *Magdalen College Pontifical*.[4] Leo the Great implies that this rule was in force in Egypt early in the fifth century. Proterius, Bishop of Alexandria, was murdered on that day, and Leo says that "the hallowing of the chrism had failed."[5] But in the East Syrian rite, in which ordinary oil is used, it is consecrated by the presbyter at

---

administers it. For the Sarum Effeta see Maskell, i. 11. (ii) It was common custom, in East and West, to hallow the font by pouring in oil or chrism, or both, in the form of a cross: so Ildephonsus (§ 109); *Ord. Rom.* vii (§ 10); *Miss. Gall. Vet.* (Mabillon, i. 324); *Bobbio Miss.* (Neale and Forbes, p. 268); *Miss. Goth.* (ed. Bannister, i. 77); Ps.-Dionysius Areop. (ii. 7: *μύρον*); Aelfric (as below); Roman and Sarum (Maskell, i. 21, and *Magdalen College Pontifical*, perhaps of Hereford or of Canterbury, ed. H. A. Wilson, H.B.S. 1910, p. 176—there with oil and chrism—and *Ordinale Exon.*, ed. J. N. Dalton, H.B.S. 1909, i. 323, see below, § 8); and the Eastern rites, Coptic, West Syrian, Maronite, and (explicitly in some manuscripts, implicitly in others) East Syrian (Denzinger, i. 207, 276, 346, 373), Greek (*Rit. Arm.* p. 403, Littledale, *op. cit.* p. 24), and Armenian (*Rit. Arm.* p. 95, Denzinger, i. 387, 394). (iii) In some Western countries there was an unction of catechumens apart from baptism as above, or at their reception—Augustine seems to allude to this when he says that Jesus anointed the blind man and "perhaps made him a catechumen" (*in Johan.* cap. 9, tract. xliv, § 2)—or at the third scrutiny (Synod of Rome, A.D. 402, can. 8), or before becoming *competentes* (Isidore of Seville, *de Eccl. Off.* ii. 20, Hittorp, p. 32). But we must note that the name "oil of catechumens," which was common at a later date, usually refers to the anointing immediately before the immersion. Instead of the above unction during the catechumenate we find an imposition of the hand, separate from and earlier than baptism, in Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* (the "*Egyptian Church Order*": the Latin is wanting), in the *Testament of our Lord* (ii. 5) and in the *Canons of Hippolytus* (can. xvii [19]). In the later Western writings "three oils" are distinguished, as in Aelfric's *Second Epistle*, *c.* A.D. 1000 (H. Soames, *Suppl. to the "Anglo-Saxon Church*," London, 1844, p. 12 f.): (*a*) "holy oil" to sign "the heathen child" on breast and between shoulders before immersion; (*b*) "holy chrism" to sign the child after immersion, chrism being also put into the font; (*c*) "sick man's oil" in accordance with the teaching of St. James.

[1] Ed. Wilson, p. 49.

[2] Ed. Wilson, p. 69 ff.

[3] Ed. R. M. Woolley, H.B.S. 1917, p. 36 ff.

[4] Ed. Wilson, p. 159 ff.

[5] *Ep.* clvi. 5, to the Emperor Leo.

the time of baptism.[1] The Malabarese were for this reason accused by the Portuguese inquisitors of not having confirmation at all.[2] In the West also we find some exceptions; the first Council of Toledo (A.D. 400) allows the consecration of the chrism to take place at any time,[3] and in Gaul it perhaps took place on Palm Sunday.[4] The oil, as opposed to the chrism, was usually consecrated at the time of the service by the officiant.

The rule as to the consecration of the chrism being confined to the episcopal order is found at the first Council of Toledo,[5] in Pope Innocent I,[6] at the second Council of Carthage[7] under Bishop Genethlius, A.D. 387 or 390, and the third, A.D. 397, which is very emphatic,[8] as is the Council of Hippo,[9] A.D. 393. Earlier still in the fourth century Didymus of Alexandria,[10] the teacher of Jerome, says that "the bishop alone, by grace from above, makes (τελεῖ) the chrism." The same rule is found in Augustine,[11] at Vaison in Gaul,[12] A.D. 442, at the second Council of Seville,[13] A.D. 619, in Amalarius[14] and Aquinas.[15] As an exception, John the Deacon, while laying down the same rule, says that in the troubles in Africa caused by Hunneric, presbyters, with the bishop's consent, were allowed to consecrate the chrism.[16]

In the West Syrian, Maronite, Egyptian, and Armenian Churches the patriarch (in the Armenian the catholicos) consecrates the chrism, and in the three last bishops are not now allowed to do so.[17]

---

[1] Denzinger, i. 372. The Holy Ghost is invoked, and a little of the "holy oil" said to be descended from St. John is added (A. J. Maclean and W. H. Browne, *The Catholicos of the East*, London, 1892, pp. 247, 269).

[2] G. B. Howard, *Christians of St. Thomas*, Oxford, 1864, p. 328.

[3] Can. 20.

[4] L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, Eng. tr., London, 1903, p. 320.

[5] Can. 20.

[6] *Ep. ad Decent.* 3.

[7] Can. 3, Mansi, iii. 691, 867 (repetition).

[8] Can. 36.

[9] Can. 24.

[10] *de Trin.* ii. 15.

[11] *de Bapt. c. Donat.* v. 28.

[12] Can. 3.

[13] Can. 7.

[14] *de Eccl. Off.* i. 27 (Hittorp, p. 139 *a*).

[15] *Summa Theologiæ*, pt. 3, qu. lxxii. 3.

[16] *Ep. ad Senar.* 7.

[17] For the Armenians (8th cent.) see Denzinger, i. 55 (where bishops were then allowed to consecrate); and *cf.* M. Ormanian, *Church of Armenia*, London, 1912, pp. 133, 137; also Thompson, p. 169.

5. Imposition of the Hand

The custom of laying on the hand in confirmation was in the earliest ages apparently universal, except in the Syrian Church, and was an action quite separate from the anointing, which it followed. But whereas in the New Testament the plural "hands" is used,[1] in the subsequent history one hand only was in most cases imposed, whether for confirmation, ordination, exorcism, or blessing.[2] It should be stated, however, that where the Greek χειροθεσία is used, and perhaps the Syriac *syamidha*, there is a doubt whether two hands are intended or one only.

The laying on of the hand in confirmation is mentioned by Tertullian[3] at the end of the second century; Irenæus, rather earlier, speaks of it as used by the Apostles,[4] though he does not explicitly say that it was retained in the Church. In the third century the *de Rebaptismate* emphasizes it,[5] and Cyprian calls both it and the immersion sacraments.[6] Optatus speaks of it in the fourth century,[7] and, indeed, in "Africa" the very greatest importance was attached to it; the Donatists held that there could be no gift of the Spirit without it,[8] and Augustine himself emphasizes it.[9] In Spain also the laying on of the hand was important, as we see in the decrees of the Council of Elvira,[10] *c.* A.D. 305, and of the second Council of Seville,[11] A.D. 619, and in Isidore of Seville[12] and Ildephonsus.[13]

In other parts of the West, while imposition of the hand is frequently mentioned, it is less emphasized. At Rome, after the post-baptismal anointing with chrism and the clothing in white, the Pope laid his hand on the neophytes when saying the prayer for the Holy Ghost, and then signed them with the sign of the cross.[1] The laying on of the hand is neither mentioned nor negatived in the *Einsiedeln Ordo*,[2] the *Ordo Romanus* vii,[3] John the Deacon, and in the *Gregorian Sacramentary*,[4] where the prayer for the sevenfold gifts is called "Oratio ad infantes consignandos." In North Italy the laying on of the hand was merged in the signing.[5] In Gaul, Ireland, and Britain it is found; the Council of Orange on the Rhone, A.D. 441, says[6] that chrismation need not be repeated when confirmation is separated from baptism and when it has taken place at baptism, and this probably implies that confirmation was administered by the laying on of the hand in that case, or, if anointing had not already taken place, by chrism also. In the ninth century Amalarius mentions[7] the laying on of the hand by the bishop; and other references, among several, are in Hilary of Poitiers[8] († A.D. 368), Bede[9] († A.D. 735), and Alcuin ("manuum," plural). In the later Roman rite it is not explicitly mentioned, but is merged in the signing with chrism[10]; but in several books (not in Maskell) the bishop extends his hands over or towards all the candidates together, *e.g.* in the *Magdalen College Pontifical*,[11] and in the present *Pontificale Romanum*.[12]

---

[1] Unambiguous cases are Acts viii. 19 (this rules viii. 17), xix. 6, Heb. vi. 2; and for healing: Mark v. 23, vi. 5, Luke iv. 40, xiii. 13, Acts xxviii. 8; for blessing: Matt. xix. 15; for ordination (?): 1 Tim. v. 22, 2 Tim. i. 6. But Matt. ix. 18, Mark vii. 32, Rev. i. 17 are exceptions.

[2] For the Church Orders see J. Cooper and A. J. Maclean, *Test. of our Lord*, Edinburgh, 1902, p. 161, where some exceptions are noted; others are mentioned in this essay.

[3] *de Bapt.* 8 (sing.), *de Res. Carn.* 8 (sing).

[4] *Hær.* I. xxiii. 1, IV. xxxviii. 2.

[5] § 3 f.

[6] *Ep.* lxxii [lxxi] 1; *cf.* lxxiii [lxxii] 6, 9, lxxiv [lxxiii] 5.

[7] *de Schism. Don.* iv. 7, vii. 4 (see above, § 3, p. 31).

[8] Augustine, *Serm.* cclxvi. 6 Ben.; cf. *c. Litt. Petiliani*, ii. 81.

[9] *Serm.* cccxxiv. Ben.

[10] Can. 38 (sing.).

[11] Can. 7.

[12] *de Eccles. Off.* ii. 25 (Hittorp, p. 36).

[13] *de Cogn. Bapt.* i. 128 f.

In the East the imposition of the hand died out earlier than in the West, and, indeed, in the early Syrian Church there is no trace of it[1]; it lasted in Egypt longer than in other Eastern countries. Origen, in the third century, speaks of it as used by the Apostles in, or after, baptism.[2] The Church Orders are emphatic as to its use; Hippolytus, in his *Apostolic Tradition* (the "*Egyptian Church Order*"),[3] is explicit on the subject, as also are the *Testament of our Lord*[4] and the *Canons of Hippolytus*.[5] Still earlier, Clement of Alexandria speaks of it[6] as used by the "presbyter" (*i.e.* in Alexandria, the bishop), apparently in confirmation, and in this connexion he deprecates the wearing of false hair. Elsewhere he quotes Theodotus the Valentinian[7] by saying that those Gnostics used it in baptism. This is in contrast to the language of Irenæus and Hippolytus,[8] who speak of the Gnostic use of unction, but not of their laying on the hand. With the Egyptian evidence we may compare the developed Coptic and Ethiopic rites,[9] in which there is a laying on of the hand (in the Ethiopic, "hands") after the post-baptismal anointing.

---

[1] *Gelas. Sacr.* (ed. Wilson, p. 86), and the St. Amand MS. in Duchesne, *op. cit.* p. 470.

[2] Duchesne, p. 483 ("consignat et chrismat").

[3] § 12; Mabillon, ii. 77-84.

[4] Ed. Wilson, p. 57.

[5] *de Sacr.* iii. 2 [8]; *de Myst.* vi. f.

[6] Can. 2.

[7] *de Eccl. Off.* i. 27 (Hittorp, p. 142).

[8] *in Matt.* cap. xix. § 3.

[9] *Vit. S. Cuth.* 29; *in Act.* viii.

[10] For Sarum see Maskell, i. 34 f.

[11] Ed. Wilson, p. 178.

[12] So in the East Syrian rite (see above, § 3 *b*) the priest, during the prayer called *syāmīdhā* (= χειροθεσία), which vaguely refers to the gift of the Holy Ghost, passes (*maʿbhar*) his right hand over the heads of all the candidates; he then signs them and says another *syāmīdhā* over them (*Lit. of Adai and Mari*, S.P.C.K. 1893, p. 72). But Denzinger (i. 375) mentions a real laying on of the hand on each neophyte in this rite.

It is noteworthy that this custom obtained in Cappadocia in the third century, as is witnessed by Firmilian.[10] But in the East generally it disappeared, or at least became unimportant. Cyril of Jerusalem (A.D. 348) does not mention it, though he refers to St. Peter's using it to give the Spirit.[11] At the Council of Laodicea in Phrygia chrism only is mentioned.[12] The evidence of the *Apostolic Constitutions* is rather ambiguous. We have seen[13] that this work lays stress on the post-baptismal unction, which it adds to its sources,[14] and it may be asked whether it had also a laying on of the hand. In vii. 22 (enlarged from the *Didache*) there is a sealing with unguent, and this is said to be a partaking of the Holy Spirit; no laying on of the hand is mentioned. In vii. 44 (from an unknown source) we read after the prayer at the post-baptismal anointing, "The power of the laying on of the hand to [lit. of] each one is this." In iii. 16 (from the *Older Didascalia*), a passage about the baptism of women and the services of deaconesses, the bishop is to anoint the woman's head only, "in the χειροθεσία," and the source has the same direction (*cf.* ii. 32, in both works, Funk, i. 114 f.). In the enumeration of the duties of bishop and presbyter in viii. 28 χειροθετεῖν is perhaps used in the sense of "confirming."[1] What, then, is the meaning of this evidence? It has been suggested that χειροθεσία in this work, and therefore in the *Didascalia*, is only a metaphorical name for unction, perhaps due to the recollection of a real laying on of hands in Acts. This is perhaps hardly probable, but at least the χειροθεσία and the unction are one action, with which the giving of the Holy Spirit is connected.

---

[1] See above, § 3 (*b*).

[2] *de Princ.* I. iii. 2, 7.

[3] Connolly, p. 185; Hauler, p. 111.

[4] ii. 9.

[5] Can. xix [136].

[6] *Pæd.* iii. 11 (sing.).

[7] *Excerpt. Theodoti*, 22.

[8] See above, § 3, p. 29.

[9] Denzinger, i. 211, 220, 232.

[10] See below, § 6.

[11] *Cat.* xvi. 26.

[12] Can. 48.

[13] Above, § 3 (*c*), p. 34 f.

[14] Funk gives the parallel passages.

Later Greek writers speak of the laying on of the hand, perhaps as a piece of antiquarianism, and equate it to the "signing" or "sealing"; *e.g.* John Damascene in the eighth century,[2] and Theophylact, exarch of Bulgaria in the eleventh.[3] The latter, after quoting the example of the laying on of hands by the Apostles at Samaria, says that "the same order" was still observed. For the theological significance of the laying on of the hand see below, § 7.

6. CONFIRMATION AND THE RECEPTION OF HERETICS

Closely connected with the subject of unction and the laying on of the hand is that of the reception of former heretics into the Church. In the West and in "Africa," and originally, as it would appear, in at least some parts of the East, it was the general custom to receive them by imposition of the hand. There was in the third century a great controversy, in which Cyprian and Pope Stephen were the protagonists, as to whether they should be rebaptized, Cyprian maintaining the affirmative as against the Roman custom. Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, agreed with Cyprian, and incidentally he says[4] that bishops, whom he calls "presiding elders," possess "the power of baptizing, of laying on hands, and of ordaining." Both sides agreed that the Holy Spirit could not be given outside the Church; and therefore the laying on of the hand was (especially before the time of Jerome and Augustine, who looked on it as a benediction merely) almost always regarded as equivalent to confirmation. Eventually the Africans accepted the Roman practice of receiving heretics by the laying on of the hand only, at the Council of Carthage, held A.D. 348.[1]

---

[1] See below, § 9.

[2] *de Hær.* i. 97, ed. M. Le Quien, Paris, 1712.

[3] *in Act.* viii. 8.

[4] Cyprian, *Ep.* lxxv [lxxiv] 7 f.

The following authorities, among others, expressly say that the imposition of the hand on heretics was for the reception of the Holy Ghost: Cyprian[2]; Firmilian (as above); the *de Rebaptismate*,[3] which elsewhere says[4] that "outside the Church there is no Holy Spirit," language echoed by Augustine himself[5]; the first Council of Arles,[6] A.D. 314; Leo the Great[7]; and Gregory the Great,[8] who says that the Easterns received heretics by unction.

Where confirmation was by unction only, or where the latter was emphasized more than the imposition of the hand, so as quite to overshadow it, heretics were received by unction, as in Didymus of Alexandria,[9] at the Councils of Orange,[10] A.D. 441, and Epaon,[11] A.D. 517; so also the Trullan Council at Constantinople[12] (A.D. 692) directs certain heretics to be received by unction, while others are to be rebaptized. Basil, also, directs[13] the reception of heretics by unction. For Gregory the Great see above. Theodoret[14] says that the Novatians were anointed on reception because they did not use unction in baptism.

---

[1] Can. I.

[2] *Ep.* lxxiii [lxxii] 9.

[3] §§ I, 4. See above, § 3 (*a*).

[4] § 10.

[5] *de Bapt. c. Don.* iii. 16 [21].

[6] Can. 8.

[7] *Ep.* clxvi. 2, ad Neonem; clxvii. 18; *cf.* clix. 7, ad Nicet.

[8] *Ep.* xi. 67, ad Quiricum.

[9] *de Trin.* ii. 15 (4th cent.).

[10] Can. I ("chrism and benediction").

[11] Can. 16.

[12] Can. 95; this repeats the so-called "seventh canon" of the Second General Council (of Constantinople), an enactment really of the fifth century.

[13] *Ep.* clxxxviii. I (*canon. prima*).

[14] See above, § 3 (*a*).

7. Theological Significance of Unction and Imposition of the Hand

(*a*) The significance originally attributed to the unction seems to have been that it was the consecration of the Christian to the royal priesthood. All Christians are both kings and priests.[1] The idea of this consecration by the baptismal unction is found in Tertullian, who draws an analogy from the anointing of the Aaronic priests[2]; in the *Older Didascalia*,[3] and more emphatically in the parallel passage of the *Apostolic Constitutions*[4]; perhaps in Cyril of Jerusalem, by implication[5]; and in Jerome's work against the Luciferians,[6] written early in his life: it contains the well-known saying, "Sacerdotium laici id est baptisma," where "baptisma" is used in its fullest sense for the complete rite, though the allusion appears to be specially to the unction—a saying to which we owe the very inadequate term "lay priesthood." The conception is also found in Augustine's great work on the *City of God*,[7] in Ambrose,[8] John the Deacon,[9] Isidore of Seville,[10] in Alcuin and Rabanus Maurus his disciple,[11] and often elsewhere. Indeed, the conception soon became a commonplace. The consecration was specially connected with the anointing of the head, immediately after immersion, by John the Deacon, Alcuin, and many others.

(*b*) The general idea attached to the laying on of the hand is that of benediction, whether it is used in confirmation, ordination, absolution, or otherwise; the Syriac *syāmīdhā* (= *χειροθεσία*) and its equivalents often came to mean "a prayer of blessing."[12] In confirmation the significance of the imposition of the hand is the conveyance by an outward means of the gift of the Spirit. This is explicitly stated by Tertullian[13]; by Cyprian[14]; in the

---

[1] 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9; Rev. i. 6, v. 10, xx. 6.

[2] *de Bapt.* 7.

[3] Funk, i. 210.

[4] iii. 16.

[5] *Cat.* xxi [*Myst.* iii].

[6] § 4.

[7] xx. 10.

[8] *de Myst.* vi [30].

[9] *Ep. ad Senar.* 6.

[10] *de Eccl. Off.* ii. 25 (Hittorp, p. 36 *a*).

[11] *de Inst. Cler.* i. 30 (Hittorp, p. 323 *b*).

[12] Brightman, *Lit. E. and W.* p. 578; see above, § 5, p. 42, note.

[13] *de Bapt.* 6, 8; *de Res. Carn.* 8.

[14] *Ep.* lxxi [lxx], lxxiii [lxxii] 6, 9, lxxiv [lxxiii] 5.

Sahidic and Ethiopic versions of Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* (the "*Egyptian Church Order*"), though the corresponding Latin is more vague,[1] as also are the *Canons of Hippolytus*[2]; by Isidore of Seville,[3] and at the second Council of Seville,[4] A.D. 619; by Hilary of Poitiers[5]; Alcuin; in the shorter Coptic rite[6]; and by many others. So also the " baptism of the Spirit " is identified with the laying on of hands in the *de Rebaptismate*[7]; and Hilary of Poitiers speaks of " the sacraments of baptism and of the Spirit."[8]

(*c*) But elsewhere, where the imposition of the hand was dying out, or was less emphasized, even in Egypt also, the gift of the Spirit was associated with the chrismation, as by Sarapion of Thmuis,[9] probably by Ambrose,[10] and even by Pope Innocent I.[11] So the author of the *de Sacramentis* says[12] that at the signing the bishop (*sacerdos*) invokes the Holy Ghost in His sevenfold gifts. Cyril of Jerusalem[13] dwells on the consecration of the unguent, like that of the Eucharist, and says that its object is to convey the Holy Ghost. Basil,[14] who also lays stress on the consecration of the chrism, is not explicit as to its effect, nor is Gregory of Nyssa.[15] The gift of the Spirit is connected with the unction even by Augustine,[16] in whose writings the anointing is more prominent than in Cyprian. Pacian, Bishop of Barcelona, speaks[17] of the " sacrament [sing.] of the laver and the chrism and the bishop (*antistitis*)," and says that " by the laver sins are purged, by the chrism the Holy Ghost is poured forth," and " both we ask by the hand and mouth of the bishop." The same view we should naturally expect in the Syrian Church. Narsai says that the Spirit is given by the unction[1]; but Ephraim, from the waters of baptism.[2] The *Apostolic Constitutions* say[3] that the water stands for (ἀντί) the burial, the oil for the Holy Ghost, the seal for the cross, the unguent for the confirmation (βεβαίωσις) of the confession. This is not in the parallel *Didascalia*. The last phrase probably means the visible sign of God's confirmation of His promises; it cannot mean man's confirmation of his baptismal promises, as in this work the immersion and its complement are one rite. Later we read[4] that the unction (χρῖσμα) is the partaking of the Holy Spirit, the water the symbol of the death, and the unguent the seal of the covenants. In the developed Eastern rites we sometimes find the association of the gift of the Spirit with the chrismation; explicitly in the Coptic rite in the prayer at the unction after immersion,[5] and in the Ethiopic.[6] Other Eastern rites are confused on this point; but as immersion and confirmation are never separated in them, this is only natural. In the Armenian[7] the formula of baptism seems to speak of the Spirit as given at the immersion: "N. is [or shall be] baptized in the name, etc. Redeemed by the blood of Christ . . . that he may become [or, having become] . . . a temple of the Holy Ghost for ever."

---

[1] Hauler, p. 111; see the present writer's *Ancient Church Orders*, Cambridge, 1910, p. 106.

[2] Can. xix [137 f.]; *Anc. Ch. Ord.* p. 107.

[3] *de Eccl. Off.* ii. 26 (Hittorp, p. 36 *b*).

[4] Can. 17.

[5] *in Matt.* cap. xix. § 3.

[6] Denzinger, i. 235.

[7] §§ 3, 6; see above, § 5, p. 41.

[8] *in Matt.* cap. iv. § 27.

[9] § 16.

[10] *de Myst.* vii [42].

[11] *Ep. ad Decent.*

[12] iii. 2 [8].

[13] *Cat.* xxi [*Myst.* iii] 3.

[14] *de Spir. S.* xxvii [66].

[15] *Serm. in Bapt. Christi.*

[16] *Serm.* 227 Ben.

[17] *Serm. de Bapt.* 6 (4th cent.).

Whether the laying on of the hand or the unction was regarded as the outward means by which the Holy Ghost is given, the action complementary to immersion was regarded as having the same object as the action of the Apostles; and that the latter had as its purpose merely the obtaining of miraculous gifts—a view which in modern times has been used as a common objection to confirmation—is emphatically refuted by Augustine.[8] In fact, the doctrine that confirmation is for the gift or indwelling of the Holy Spirit is universal from the earliest ages until at least the time of Wyclif, though, since immersion, unction, and the laying on of the hand were properly one rite, there was not complete unanimity as to the proper effect of each of these three parts.

---

[1] Connolly, *Lit. Hom. of Narsai*, pp. 43, 45; see above, § 3 (*b*).

[2] *Epiph. Hymns*, v. 1.

[3] iii. 17.

[4] vii. 22.

[5] Denzinger, i. 209.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 230.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 387; *Rit. Arm.* p. 96.

[8] *de Bapt. c. Don.* iii. 16 [21].

(*d*) A few words may be added as to the scholastic view of confirmation. This may best be exhibited from the writings of Thomas of Aquinum († A.D. 1274, at the early age of 47). His *Summa Theologiæ* was written between 1265 and 1271. Confirmation being a sacrament, Aquinas sets himself to consider what are its "matter" and "form." He says that the Apostles administered confirmation by laying on of the hand (sing.) without unction of chrism, that is, of oil and balsam; yet chrism is "convenient matter" as symbolizing the gift of the Spirit, for no one "matter" is essential.[1] As to the "form," whereas according to ancient precedent it should be the prayer for the sevenfold gifts of the Spirit which we still have, almost unaltered in our Prayer Book, and which is found in the *Gregorian*[2] and *Gelasian*[3] *Sacramentaries*, Aquinas makes it the words said by the bishop at the signing: "I sign thee with the sign of the cross and confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the Name," etc.,[4] as do the *Decretum de Unione Armenorum* of Pope Eugenius IV, A.D. 1439, and the Tridentine Catechism.[5] Aquinas says, however, that no "form" is universal even in the West, nor was any "form" instituted by Christ; no one form is essential.

Both Aquinas[6] and the Tridentine Catechism[7] make Confirmation the sacrament of growth (*augmentum*) from infancy to maturity, as Baptism is the sacrament of birth. Baptism, Aquinas says,[8] is spiritual regeneration, Confirmation is spiritual growth, the Eucharist is spiritual food. The idea is derived ultimately from an anonymous Gallican homily of the fifth or sixth century, formerly attributed in error to the Eastern Eusebius of Emesa; the homilist speaks of confirmation as an increase of grace ("in confirmatione augmentum præstat ad gratiam"). But he uses "augmentum" in a sense different from that of Aquinas; he means by it an addition to former grace.[1] Aquinas' views on confirmation may be summed up in the statements that it is a sacrament in that the plenitude of the Holy Ghost is given for spiritual strength, and that it was implicitly instituted by our Lord when He promised to send the Paraclete[2]; it conveys character, but presupposes that baptism has preceded,[3] and it is for all.[4]

---

[1] *Summa Theol.* pt. 3, qu. lxxii. 2.

[2] Ed. Wilson, p. 57.

[3] Ed. Wilson, p. 87.

[4] Art. 4. But in the Supplement, qu. xxix. art. 8, he makes the prayer the "form" of Extreme Unction; not the words said in anointing.

[5] II. iii. 9.

[6] Art. 1.

[7] II. iii. 4, "confirmationem cujus virtute fideles augescunt."

[8] *Summa Theol.* pt. 3, qu. lxxiii. 1.

8. Separation of Confirmation from Baptism. Age of Confirmation

(*a*) The immersion has never been separated from confirmation in the East, whether for infants or for adults. In the West most of the early cases of separation were those of the sick or of infants; and it was inevitable that, as the civilized world became Christian, the proportions of infant to adult baptism should greatly increase. In the West, where confirmation was ordinarily confined to bishops,[5] when baptisms became so numerous that they could not be restricted to the early dawn of Easter Day, or even to a few limited occasions in the year, the tendency was to separate the two parts of the rite, the first being administered by the presbyter, the second being retained for the bishop when he should pay his next visit to the place. In the East the difficulty was solved by the presbyter being allowed to confirm as well as to baptize. Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita says expressly[6] that infants were "baptized" (the term includes confirmation) and communicated, and defends the practice, which is still that of the whole East. Even in the West immersion and confirmation are normally one office in the *Gregorian* and *Gelasian Sacramentaries*; and so, if the bishop is present, in Alcuin[7] and Amalarius.[8] The later pontificals bear witness to the same thing, while providing for the more modern practice. The *Magdalen College Pontifical* makes immersion and confirmation one office, but says[1]: "If the bishop is present [the neophyte] must be immediately confirmed with chrism, and afterwards communicated (*communicare*), but if the bishop is absent, he is to be communicated by the presbyter (before confirmation)." The *Sarum Pontifical* says,[2] that if the bishop is present, the baptized is to be confirmed immediately, and then communicated "if his age demands it."[3]

---

[1] See A. J. Mason, *Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, London, 1891, pp. 195 ff., 415 ff. Whatever view be taken of Dr. Mason's conclusions, his collection of patristic passages has laid students under a great debt of gratitude.

[2] Qu. lxxii. 1.

[3] *Ibid.* 5 f.

[4] *Ibid.* 8.

[5] See below, § 9.

[6] *de Eccl. Hier.* VII. iii. 11.

[7] *de Div. Off.*, Hittorp, p. 646. This work is perhaps not Alcuin's.

[8] *de Eccles. Off.* iv. 29 (Hittorp, p. 246).

The ancient rule which made Easter the normal day for baptism, though frequently departed from, implied the oneness of the whole rite, at least as a normal rule, and led to the baptismal office (including confirmation) being for many centuries given in the books[4] under Easter Even. The benediction of the font long remained a ceremony for that day and for the vigil of Pentecost.[5] A trace of the ancient rule is found in the *Ordinale Exon.*, which says[6] that when the fonts have been consecrated neither oil nor chrism is to be poured in unless there is anyone to be baptized. In the *Ordo Romanus Primus*[7] the district notary meets the Pope on his way to St. Mary's in Rome (Sta. Maria Maggiore) on Easter Day, and tells him how many male and how many female infants were baptized there in the night before.

There are, however, many ancient instances of the separation of immersion and confirmation in the West. Cyprian says[8] that infants should be baptized within two or three days of birth; and since the bishop confirmed in the West, this must have meant the postponement of confirmation. The Council of Elvira in S. Spain (*c.* A.D. 305) speaks[9] of baptisms by laymen and deacons; if the baptized survive they are to brought to the bishop for the laying on of the hand (or benediction). The author of the *de Rebaptismate*, who says that the two parts of the rite were *normally* joined,[1] discusses the case, which (he says) often occurs, of a baptized person who has died without being confirmed; such a one is a full Christian. Any of the Apostles might have died before the Holy Ghost came at Pentecost. The Spirit is free, and may come without confirmation, or even without baptism.[2] This shows that the separation of the two parts of the rite was common. The same thing is affirmed by Jerome's opponent in the treatise against the Luciferians, and the separation is recognized by Jerome in smaller towns and in remote places.[3] Gregory the Great talks[4] of bishops going round their dioceses "to sign [seal] infants"; this implies separation. Bede describes how Cuthbert made tours to lay the hand on those who had been "lately baptized."[5] In Gaul the separation is clearly recognized at the Council of Orange,[6] A.D. 441, and is implied, in remote places, by a passage in the King's letter to the Council of Lugo (Lucas Augusti) in N.W. Spain (*Conc. apud Lucum*, or *Lucense*), A.D. 569, which says that a bishop could not visit every charge annually.[7]

---

[1] Ed. Wilson, p. 178.

[2] Maskell, i. 25.

[3] See below, § 10.

[4] E.g. *Greg. Sacr.*, ed. Wilson, p. 54 ff.; *Miss. Goth.*, ed. Bannister, i. 75 ff.; *Magd. Coll. Pontif.* ed. Wilson, p. 169 ff.

[5] Maskell, i. 13; for the office see also *Miss. Sarum*, ed. F. H. Dickinson, Burntisland, 1861-83, p. 347 ff.

[6] Ed. Dalton, i. 323; so Dickinson, p. 354 *n.*

[7] Ed. Atchley, p. 120.

[8] *Ep.* lxiv [lviii]. 2. ad Fidum.

[9] Canons 38, 77.

In mediæval times the interval between Baptism and Confirmation grew to one year, and then to seven. At Worcester,[8] A.D. 1240, and at Chichester,[9] A.D. 1246, one year is named as the maximum; at Exeter,[10] A.D. 1287, three years; at Durham,[11] a little earlier, seven years. The *Sarum Manual* makes seven years the best age for Confirmation, after the child has learnt the Paternoster, Ave Maria, and Credo.[12] The Tridentine Catechism says much the same thing.[13] But in the earlier period the idea that a person must have arrived at something like "years of discretion" before being confirmed was unknown, except in so far as a few would postpone *baptism* for this reason.[1] The separation of the two parts of the rite was not originally due to age.

---

[1] § 10.

[2] §§ 4, 15; see above, § 3 (*a*).

[3] § 9.

[4] *Ep.* xiii. 18.

[5] *Vit. Cuth.* 29.

[6] Can. 2; see above, § 5, p. 42.

[7] Mansi, ix. 815.

[8] Wilkins, *Conc.* i. 667.

[9] *Ibid.* i. 686.

[10] *Ibid.* ii. 132.

[11] *Ibid.* i. 576.

[12] Maskell, i. 14.

[13] II. iii. 15.

In discussing this branch of the subject we must bear in mind that the word "infantes" was often used of the newly baptized, even if they were adults. Some typical instances may be seen in Tertullian[2]; in the *Pilgrimage of "Etheria"* ("*Silvia*"),[3] *c.* A.D. 390? or later; in the titles of some of Augustine's sermons[4] (*e.g.* "ad infantes seu eo die baptizatos"); in the *Canons of Hippolytus*,[5] where the writer, speaking of the custom of giving milk and honey to the neophytes, says that they are born as babes, for babes partake of milk and honey; and in Gregory the Great.[6]

(*b*) *Postponement of Baptism and Confirmation.*—This has really no connexion with the separation of the two parts of the rite. Many postponed baptism from fear of post-baptismal sin; Constantine the Great postponed it till his deathbed[7]; Satyrus, brother of Ambrose, also delayed it[8]; the Emperor Valentinian for this reason died unbaptized.[9] And there are a few exceptional writers who favoured at least a limited postponement. Tertullian[10] thought that baptism should be delayed till after marriage, and Gregory of Nazianzus[11] till the end of the third year (unless there was danger of death), in order that the child might have some elementary knowledge of the sacraments. But this was against the feeling of the Church at large, and the evidence shows that infant baptism was the approved practice. Ambrose strongly deprecates postponement.[12] And clinical baptism was discouraged as showing that it was only received through fear of death; one so baptized could not, in some places, be ordained priest, or to any clerical office.[13] But the Phrygian Council of Laodicea attaches no stigma to those thus baptized.[1] Cyprian says[2] that clinical Baptism is valid, but that if the baptized recover they should be "baptized" (*i.e.* confirmed ?).

---

[1] See below (*b*).

[2] *adv. Marc.* i. 14, "he feeds as infants" (*infantat*).

[3] Duchesne, *Chr. Wor.* p. 512.

[4] *Serm.* 224-228 Ben.

[5] Can. xix. [144].

[6] *Ep.* iv. 9, ad Jan.

[7] Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* iv. 61.

[8] Ambrose, *de Ex. Frat. Sat.* i. 48.

[9] Ambrose, *de Ob. Val.* 51-53.

[10] *de Bapt.* 18.

[11] *Orat.* xl. 28.

[12] *de Pæn.* ii. 11 [98 ff.].

[13] Council of Neocæsarea in Cappadocia (between A.D. 314 and 325), can. 12 (with some exceptions); Cornelius in Eusebius, *H.E.* vi. 43.

9. Minister of Confirmation

In the New Testament we do not read of any but Apostles confirming.[3] There may have been no hard-and-fast rule in apostolic times, and it is highly probable that least "viri apostolici," like Timothy and Titus, confirmed, as they were commissioned to ordain. In Christian antiquity the bishop was normally the minister of Confirmation, and, even when presbyters were allowed to confirm, the chrism was ordinarily consecrated by the bishop.[4] The early rule[5] seems to have been that the presbyter (or in some cases the bishop) immersed, and anointed after baptism where there was more than one post-baptismal unction; then the bishop signed with the chrism and laid on the hand, praying for the gift of the Spirit. This is the arrangement of Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* (the "*Egyptian Church Order*"), the *Canons of Hippolytus*, the *Testament of our Lord*, and the *Apostolic Constitutions*.[6] We find the rule that bishops are the ministers of Confirmation in Cyprian[7]; the *de Rebaptismate*[8]; Cornelius[9]; the Council of Elvira[10]; Ambrose (who says[11] that after immersion the candidates went up to the "sacerdos," *i.e.* bishop); the *de Sacramentis*[12]; and Jerome,[13] who makes it a strict rule, naming no exception, yet only as a matter of order, not of necessity (*ad legem necessitatis*); he says that many in remote places died unconfirmed, because they had not been visited by the bishop. On the other hand, he elsewhere[1] makes ordination the only part of a bishop's functions which a presbyter cannot perform, language which is also found in the *Canons of Hippolytus*.[2] Pacian says[3] that the laver and chrism descended from the Apostles to the bishops. Pope Innocent I denies that presbyters can seal and give the Holy Ghost; they can baptize and then anoint (either in the presence or in the absence of the bishop) with chrism consecrated by the bishop, but cannot seal the brow with that oil; this can only be done by bishops when they transmit the Paraclete Spirit.[4]

---

[1] Can. 47.

[2] *Ep.* lxix [lxxv] 13.

[3] Acts viii. 15, 17, xix. 6.

[4] See above, § 4.

[5] But for the Syrian custom see above, § 3 (*b*).

[6] Possibly this author allows the presbyter to confirm in abnormal cases. In viii. 28 it is said that he χειροθετεῖ ("lays on the hand"), in addition to blessing, but may not ordain; some take this to refer to absolution.

[7] *Ep.* lxxiii [lxxii] 9, ad Jubaianum. So Firmilian (above, § 6).

[8] § 3 f.

[9] Eusebius, *H.E.* vi. 43.

[10] Can. 38, 77. The suggested implication that if a presbyter had baptized he could also confirm is precarious.

[11] *de Myst.* vi. [29].

[12] iii. 2 [8].

[13] *adv. Lucif.* 9.

As time went on, Confirmation was in the West rigidly confined to bishops. So expressly the second Council of Seville,[5] A.D. 619, which also forbids presbyters to baptize (*tingere*) in the presence of the bishop, and Isidore of Seville,[6] though he had echoed[7] Jerome's words about ordination being the only differentiation in function between presbyter and bishop. So also Rabanus Maurus,[8] Archbishop of Mainz († A.D. 815), Walafred Strabo[9] († A.D. 849), and Micrologus[10] (*c.* A.D. 1080), who mentions Gregory the Great's exception (see below). Even the Eastern Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita distinguishes[11] the priests who baptize from the "hierarch" who seals and communicates the neophyte. Bede says that Philip, not being an Apostle, could not have laid on hands at Samaria.[12] Amalarius,[13] Theophylact,[14] and the Tridentine Catechism[15] say the same thing. At the great schism between East and West at the beginning of the eleventh century the

---

[1] *Ep.* cxlvi, ad Evangelum.

[2] Can. iv [32].

[3] *Ep.* i. 6; see above, § 7, p. 47. His Novatianist opponents seem to have used unction; see above, § 3 (*a*).

[4] *Ep. ad. Decent.* 3, the first use of the name "Paraclete" in this connexion.

[5] Can. 7.

[6] *de Eccl. Off.* ii. 26 (Hittorp, p. 36 *b*).

[7] *Ib.* ii. 7 (Hittorp, p. 22 *a*).

[8] *de Inst. Cler.* i. 6 (Hittorp, p. 315 *b*).

[9] *de Reb. Eccles.* 26 (Hittorp, p. 414 *b*).

[10] *de Eccl. Obs.* 21 (Hittorp, p. 445 *a*).

[11] *de Eccl. Hier.* ii. 7.

[12] *in Act. Ap.* viii.

[13] *de Eccl. Off.* i. 27 (Hittorp, p. 142 *b*).

[14] *in Act. Ap.* viii. 8.

[15] II. iii. 10. It says that the bishop is the "ordinary" minister of Confirmation, and condemns the Eastern custom.

Latins treated Greek Confirmations as null because administered by presbyters, and they reconfirmed the Bulgarians. Aquinas, while maintaining the rule, says that the Pope can by dispensation allow presbyters to confirm.[1]

But even in the West presbyters sometimes confirmed. Augustine tells[2] of an infant taken "to the presbyters" to be baptized, sanctified, anointed, and to receive the laying on of the hand; "sanctified" here perhaps means "communicated," as Augustine says that "all the sacraments were completed," and that the child then died. Gregory the Great at first allowed presbyters only to anoint "those who were to be baptized" on the breast, the bishop afterwards anointing on the forehead.[3] But later[4] he allowed the latter action to presbyters if bishops were not to be found, though he says that the limitation of it to the episcopate was "the ancient use of our Church." In Gaul, up to the time of Charlemagne, and in Spain and Ireland, presbyters frequently confirmed with chrism consecrated by a bishop, especially in country places. This is implied in the directions to the presbyter to get the chrism from his own bishop, as in the *Gallican Statutes*[5] (*Statuta Ecclesiæ Antiqua*), *c.* A.D. 500, and at the Council of Auxerre[6] (*Con. Autissiodorense*), A.D. 578. It is perhaps implied by the rule that a presbyter might, if the bishop was absent, give heretics "chrism and benediction," made at Orange,[7] A.D. 441, and a similar one of Epaon,[8] A.D. 517, and by the direction of the first Council of Toledo,[9] A.D. 400, that deacons or sub-deacons were to fetch the chrism consecrated by the bishop. In the *Missale Gothicum*[10] there is no difference made between the minister at the immersion and the minister at confirmation; and in the *Stowe Missal*[11] it is explicitly said that the presbyter confirms. Yet Amalarius makes the bishop the normal minister of Confirmation,[1] and holds that originally he did all the anointing.

---

[1] *Sum. Theol.* pt. 3, qu. lxxii. 11.

[2] *Serm.* 324, Ben.

[3] *Ep.* iv. 9, ad Jan.

[4] *Ep.* iv. 26 (here "baptizandos" is used loosely).

[5] Can. 36. These canons were formerly ascribed to a Council of Carthage, a hundred years earlier.

[6] Can. 6, Mansi, ix. 911.

[7] Can. 1.

[8] Can. 16.

[9] Can. 20.

[10] Ed. Bannister, i. 76 f.

[11] Warren, p. 216.

For Egypt we have the evidence of "Ambrosiaster." He says[2] that the presbyter in Egypt "seals" (*consignat*) in the absence of the bishop, but he does not affirm that the presbyter consecrated the chrism. Clearly the bishop in the ordinary way confirmed, as in the Church Orders. Sarapion says nothing except that the bishop blesses the oil[3] (he only gives the bishop's part of the services), and possibly the presbyter did the rest[4]; yet this is against the evidence of the Church Orders.

In other parts of the East presbyters were freely allowed to confirm; yet the Church Orders show that in some regions besides Egypt the bishop remained the normal minister for longer than is sometimes supposed. In the present Eastern offices no difference is made between the minister at the immersion and the minister at the chrismation. It should, however, be stated that theoretically the bishop is the minister of the whole rite; the only question was whether the whole, or merely a part of it, could be delegated to a presbyter.

10. CONFIRMATION AND FIRST COMMUNION

In all the older rites First Communion immediately follows the rite of initiation; early examples are to be seen in Tertullian[5] and in the *Acts of Judas Thomas*.[6] The Communion may often have been with the reserved sacrament,[7] but not when the baptism took place at Easter.

---

[1] *de Eccl. Off.* i. 27 (Hittorp, p. 142).

[2] *in Eph.* iv. 12 (4th or 5th cent.). This certainly refers to Confirmation, not as Lightfoot suggests in his "Dissert. on the Christian Ministry" (*Philippians*, new ed., London, 1903, p. 231) to ordination. The same thing is said of Alexandria and all Egypt in Pseudo-Augustine, *Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test.* (ed. Ben. vol. iii. app., col. 93); this writer may have been Ambrosiaster, and seems to have been a presbyter writing at Rome (C. Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, new ed., London 1919, p. 157 *n*). There is here a badly supported reading, "consecrat" for "consignat"; this would refer to the Eucharist, for it could not refer to the consecration of the chrism (above, § 4), still less (used absolutely) to ordination. See Gore, p. 119.

[3] §§ 15, 17.

[4] But the bishop seems to say the prayer at the anointing (§ 16).

[5] *de Res. Carn.* 8.

[6] See above, § 3 (*b*), p. 32.

[7] As in the *Gelas. Sacr.*, when there was no Mass (Warren, *op. cit.* p. 219).

The close connexion of immersion, Confirmation, and Communion is the reason for our having two accounts of the Eucharist in many writers, one in connexion with Baptism, and one with the ordinary Sunday Service or with the ordination of a bishop; as in Justin,[1] Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* (the *Egyptian Church Order*),[2] the *Testament of our Lord*,[3] and the *Canons of Hippolytus*.[4] Directions for the communion of the newly baptized are found in several of the Eastern developed rites: the Maronite,[5] Coptic,[6] Ethiopic,[7] Greek,[8] Armenian,[9] and West Syrian,[10] but not in the East Syrian.[11]

We must notice some peculiarities. Communion comes between the immersion and the Confirmation in some Western authorities, though not in the earliest. Alcuin has the order: clothing in white—anointing the head with chrism—covering the head with a mystic covering that the candidate may understand that he is king and priest—"confirming" with the body and blood of the Lord [12]—receiving the Spirit of sevenfold grace by the laying on of the hands (pl.) of the chief priest. Rabanus Maurus speaks of Communion after Baptism, though he does not mention Confirmation.[13] In the *Magdalen College Pontifical* [14] the order is: immersion—confirmation—communion; but if the bishop is absent, Communion comes at the time of baptism. This is also implied in the *Gregorian Sacramentary*.[15] Archbishop Peckham, of Canterbury, A.D. 1279-1294, insists on Confirmation coming before Communion except in cases of "reasonable" hindrance, or danger of death [16]; but this shows that the custom was otherwise.

---

[1] *Apol.* i. 56 (*cf.* 67).

[2] Hauler, p. 112, *cf.* p. 106 f.

[3] ii. 10, *cf.* i. 23.

[4] Can. xix [142 ff.], *cf.* iii. [20 ff.]

[5] Denzinger, i. 350.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 211, 221.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 231.

[8] Conybeare, *Rit. Arm.*, p. 406 (the liturgy follows the baptism); omitted in Littledale, *op. cit.* p. 27.

[9] Denzinger, i. 390.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 288; omitted in the rite at p. 279.

[11] *Ibid.* pp. 377, 382; in practice baptism follows the liturgy (*Catholicos of the East*, p. 274).

[12] See above, § 2, p. 27.

[13] *de Inst. Cler.* ii. 38 (Hittorp, p. 346).

[14] Ed. Wilson, p. 178.

[15] See above, § 3 (*c*), p. 38.

[16] W. Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, i. tit. 6, § 5 (ed. Oxford, 1679, p. 40); Maskell, i, p. ccxv.

From Peckham the rule came into the *Sarum Manual*.[1] But it has long been the custom in Roman Catholic countries to receive First Communion shortly before Confirmation. Yet in France, *c.* A.D. 1650, it was apparently not so. The instructive *Letters of a Turkish Spy in Paris*[2] describe the baptism of a Moslem convert on one day, the Confirmation on the next day, when he was anointed with " chrism or holy oil, as they call it, which they say has a virtue to confirm and strengthen him in his new religion " ; then on the third day he walked in procession through the streets clothed in white linen, with music playing before him, the ground strewed with flowers, " to the great mosque of the city," where a priest " gave him that which they esteem the body of the Messiah, but in reality is only a wafer with the figure of a man crucified on it," which " they make the poor ignorant people believe they can change with four words into an immortal God."

In some cases, as in the *Stowe Missal*,[3] the Communion of the neophytes is in both kinds together, doubtless by intinction. Among the Armenians[4] the infant neophyte apparently does not actually receive Holy Communion, but the holy " particle is placed in contact with the tongue."

In these pages an attempt has been made to gather together the principal facts with regard to the theory and practice of Confirmation in the period indicated. It will be seen that though there was great variety in detail, all were agreed in the endeavour to follow the example of the Apostles in providing a complement to the immersion, in order to claim our Lord's promise to send the Holy Spirit to strengthen the Church.

---

[1] Maskell, i. 31.

[2] Eng. tr., 12th ed., London, 1748, V, ii. 17

[3] Warren, p. 218.

[4] M. Ormanian, *Church of Armenia*, p. 115.

CHAPTER III

CONFIRMATION IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

By S. L. Ollard

SUMMARY

1. From 1500 to the Accession of Queen Elizabeth in 1558.
2. From the Accession of Queen Elizabeth, 1558, to the Publication of the Fifth Book of Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity," 1597.
3. From the Publication of the Fifth Book of Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity," 1597, to the Primacy of Archbishop Laud, 1633.
4. From the Primacy of Archbishop Laud, 1633, to the Restoration, 1660.
5. From the Restoration, 1660, to the Revolution of 1688.
6. From the Revolution of 1688 to 1850.

APPENDICES

I. Some Visitation Returns of Archbishop Herring, 1743.
II. Confirmations in the Diocese of York, 1737-1771.
III. Eighteenth-Century Orders of Confirmation with Chrism and Consignation.
IV. A List of Anglican Works on Confirmation.

CONFIRMATION IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

1500-1850

Period 1. From 1500 to the Accession of Queen Elizabeth in 1558

The fact that a gift of the Holy Ghost was given to baptized Christians by prayer and the laying on of a bishop's hands does not seem to have been doubted in England for at least the first twenty years of the sixteenth century, though it is possible that, as some recent writers have contended, there was in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries a certain amount of indifference to Confirmation.[1] The subject was brought into notice, however, in 1520, when Martin Luther published his treatise on the Babylonish Captivity and reduced the number of the Sacraments from seven to three, viz., Baptism, Penance, and the Eucharist, thus excluding Confirmation from the category. King Henry VIII replied to Luther with his *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum* in 1521, and he dealt in due course with Confirmation. He attacks Luther's statement that Confirmation has no promise of Christ in its support, by pointing out the weakness of the argument from silence; if Luther had only St. John's Gospel he would deny the institution of the Eucharist, and he adds that St. John records that there are many other things not written in his book. For the promise of the Holy Spirit, the king quotes St. John's Gospel, ch. xv. and ch. xvi. He has a more elaborate argument, from Hugh of St. Victor, to the effect that Christ is so called from chrism, the Christian has his name from Christ, and everyone ought to receive anointing because in Christ we are an elect race, a royal priesthood, and we are only anointed by bishops. Another argument for the necessity of Confirmation is by analogy from Nature. In life there is first the process of generation and then growth; so with spiritual life, it is acquired by the generative process of baptism, but " opus est sacramento confirmationis per quam vita spiritualis ad perfectam virtutem perducitur et Spiritus Sanctus datur ad perfectum robur."

Further, as to the benefits of the Sacrament the king quotes the Pseudo-Melchiades: " In baptismo regeneramur ad vitam, post baptismum confirmamur ad pugnam." So this Sacrament is neither a new nor a vain thing, and does not lack grace, since it confers the Spirit of grace and truth, and he quotes St. Jerome *Adv. Luciferianos*.

Finally the king cites the account of the laying on of hands by St. Peter and St. John at Samaria from Acts viii, and concludes by marvelling that Luther should contend for Confirmation only as a rite or ceremony and deny it to be a true sacrament, since not only from the witness of holy doctors and from the faith of the whole Church, but also from the plainest places of Holy Scripture, the fact that it is a sacrament is clearly shown.[1] One result of this book was to win for Henry the title Fidei Defensor.

---

[1] B. L. Manning, *The People's Faith in the Time of Wyclif* (1919), pp. 59, 60; Capes, *English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, p. 229.

The question of the place of Confirmation in the Christian scheme, its history and its theology, was not settled finally by the king's argument; in the next decade there is a remarkable bit of evidence to show how thoroughly the question of Confirmation was discussed afresh. It is printed by Strype in the Appendix to his *Ecclesiastical Memorials*,[2] and headed, "The Judgment of divers Bishops and Doctors in Commission concerning Confirmation under these three Questions." The document belongs to the year 1537, and is part of the discussion upon which the *Institution of a Christian Man*, the so-called Bishops' Book, was based.[3]

Before that book appeared one or two other facts illustrate the progress of the debate. The Princess Elizabeth was born at the Palace at Greenwich on September 7, 1533. Three days later, on September 10, she was baptized in the Church of the Grey Friars at Greenwich, and confirmed immediately afterwards. The officiant at the baptism was Stokesley, Bishop of London (he held the see 1530-1539), and the godfather was Cranmer, who had been consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury six months before. Cranmer confirmed the baby. The practice was a witness to the primitive order in which Confirmation and Baptism were one rite. The fact that it happened, and in the case of such an important child, might suggest that Henry and his theological advisers had been making researches into the history of Confirmation; it is stated, however, that "when the bishop was present confirmation followed baptism immediately in the case of infants as well as of adults."[1]

---

[1] The edition of the *Assertio*, etc., which I have used for this account is the original printed edition in the Bodleian Library, an edition in which there is no pagination. The King's answer is translated and summarized by Collier in his *Eccles. Hist.* (ed. 1840), iv. 31-47; the passage concerning Confirmation appears on pp. 40, 41.

[2] *Ecclesiastical Memorials* (folio ed. 1721), i. 228, *seq.* Appendix No. LXXXVIII. Strype prints it from the original in the British Museum, Cottonian collection, Cleopatra, v. It is printed also in part by Collier (1841 ed.), ix. 216, *seq.*

[3] The date of the document and its place in the story are discussed by Dr. James Gairdner in his *Lollardy and the Reformation in England* (1906), ii. 320-328.

Another fact worthy of notice is that the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury in 1536 presented to the Upper House a book of erroneous doctrines, *Mala Dogmata*, which were being publicly preached, printed, and professed in the realm. Of these they record sixty-seven, and the fourth of then concerns Confirmation.

4. "Item, That children ought not in any wise to be confirmed of the bishops afore they come to the age of discretion."

Possibly another of the *gravamina* refers to the same subject.

19. "Item, That the hallowed oil is no better than the Bishop of Rome's grease or butter."[2]

At this time, indeed since the autumn of 1535, Henry was meditating an alliance with the Lutherans against the Pope and the Emperor, and it was necessary to discover how far the two parties could come to a doctrinal agreement.[3] In April 1536 the sixteen Articles of Wittenberg were sent to England on behalf of the Lutherans. The result of these deliberations was the Ten Articles "to stablyshe Christen Quietnes and Unitie amonge us" put out by Royal Authority after being agreed to by Convocation in the summer of 1536 and by the Royal Injunctions of the same date (§ 2) ordered to be declared by all deans, parsons, vicars and curates in their "sermons and other collations."[1] The Ten Articles dealt only with three sacraments, Baptism, Penance, and the Eucharist, which suggested an acceptance of the view of Luther which Henry VIII had expressly attacked in 1521, and to that extent depreciated Confirmation. The Ten Articles were not popular, and early in 1537 a special Convocation met to discuss a new formulary, particularly the four sacraments omitted from the Ten Articles. The discussion has a curiously modern air since it was conducted partly by means of a questionnaire to which the divines individually gave their answers, and these answers register exactly the opinions about it which were held in the English Church at the time. The questions asked were:

---

[1] Mr. Lockton in *Ch. Quart. Rev.*, April 1925, p. 35. For the account of the ceremony see Stow, *Annals* (ed. 1615), fol. 568, *Wriothesley's Chronicle* (Camden Soc.), i. 22, 23.

[2] The *Mala Dogmata* are printed by Fuller, *Church History*, bk. v, sect. iv (ed. 1837, ii. 69, 74). Fuller dates the presentation of the articles 23 July, Dixon 23 June (*Hist. of Ch. of England*, 2nd ed. (1884), i. 404).

[3] There is a good account of this in Gairdner, *Lollardy*, etc., ii. 314 *seq.*

1. "Whether this Sacrament be a Sacrament of the New Testament instituted by Christ, or not?"
2. "What is the outward Sign, and invisible Grace, that is conferred in the same?"
3. "What Promises be made that the said Graces shall be received by this Sacrament?"

To these questions the answers of seven diocesan bishops, including the two Primates, and thirteen other divines (one of whom is anonymous) are given. They divide themselves broadly into two groups, the one of conservatives, the other of reformers.

Of the conservatives, to question 1, the Archbishop of York (Edward Lee) replies that he holds that Acts viii. and xix. make it certain that the Sacrament of Confirmation was instituted by our Lord, the Bishop of Lincoln (Longlands, the king's confessor) agrees that it was instituted by the Lord, and the Bishop of London (Stokesley) on the same side replies curtly to the question, "It is." Of the lesser divines, Dr. Wotton, Dean of Canterbury and of York, thinks that either Confirmation was instituted by Christ or else the Apostles were not inspired by the Holy Ghost, and Dr. Bell, Archdeacon of Gloucester, Dr.

---

[1] The Ten Articles are printed in *Formularies of Faith* (Oxford, 1825), the Injunctions of 1536 in Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, etc., p. 269 *seq.*

Marshall, Archdeacon of Nottingham, Dr. Clyff, Chanter (*i.e.* Precentor) of York, afterwards Dean of Chester, Dr. Downes, Chancellor of York, Dr. Marmaduke,[1] Dr. Robinson (or Robertson),[2] "Flos et decus Oxoniæ," Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and later Dean of Durham, and Dr. Richard Smith, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, each for himself considers that Confirmation was instituted by our Lord. That is to say, three of the seven bishops and eight of the thirteen divines are conservative on the first point. The unnamed divine is practically on the same side; in a long, careful, and scholar-like reply in the course of which he quotes Acts viii, Bede, Rabanus Maurus, Erasmus, and Melancthon, he holds that as Confirmation is in the New Testament therefore it is of Christ. Dr. Wolman, Archdeacon of Sudbury, later Dean of Wells, does not appear to answer the question, nor does Dr. Buckmaster (Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge 1529, 1538, and 1539); but their answers to the later questions are certainly conservative.

On the reforming side, and most radical of all, is the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cranmer. He writes[3]:

> "There is no place in Scripture that declareth this sacrament to be instituted of Christ.
>
> "First, for the places alleged for the same be no institutions, but acts and deeds of the Apostles.
>
> "Second, these acts were done by a special gift given to the Apostles for the confirmation of God's Word at that time.
>
> "Thirdly, the said special gift doth not now remain with the successors of the Apostles."

It should be noted, however, that to his paper of answers the Archbishop added in his own hand, "Hæc respondeo salvo semper eruditiorum et ecclesiæ orthodoxæ judicio"; the answers themselves being, according to Strype, in the hand of his secretary.

---

[1] So printed in Strype, but presumably a surname has slipped out.

[2] On him see *Dict. Nat. Biog.* s.v. Robertson, Thomas.

[3] His answers are printed in *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Archbishop Cranmer* (Parker Soc.), p. 80.

The Bishop of Ely (Goodrich) found no mention of the institution of Confirmation "as it is now used" by our Lord in the New Testament, and the Bishop of Rochester (Hilsey) had a long exordium to prove that Confirmation as then used was not the same as the New Testament ceremony; the Bishop of Bangor (Capon, *alias* Salcot, late Bishop of Salisbury) held it to be a Sacrament of the New Testament, *i.e.* not instituted of Christ, but by the Fathers. Thus four of the seven bishops were on this side. Of the divines, Dr. Barber, chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer and Official of his court at Canterbury, replies that the institution of Confirmation is not clear from Holy Scripture. He thinks it was handed down in the Church from the Apostles, and Dr. Edmunds, Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge (who was privately "married" some years before such unions had been recognized as lawful by Church or State), was of the same opinion. Confirmation, he held, was not instituted by Christ by any express word of Holy Scripture, but only by tradition from the Fathers. These two alone of the divines followed the lead of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The second question of the matter, form, and grace of the Sacrament elicited equally interesting answers. The Archbishop of York held that the signing (with chrism) by the bishop, *consignatio*, was the outward sign, and that the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost were conferred by it. The Bishop of Lincoln regarded the outward sign as imposition of hands and signing of the cross on the forehead, chrism being added. The Bishop of London held the matter and form to be the words of signing with the cream and imposition of the bishop's hands. The grace is the increase of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, especially fortitude. These were the conservative bishops.

Of the divines Dean Wotton held the outward sign to be the touching and marking of the forehead by the Minister for that Sacrament deputed, and the grace to be a corroboration or strengthening to resist the ghostly enemy.

The Archdeacon of Gloucester held the matter and form to be the signing of the cross by the bishop's hand with the holy cream and the form *Ego confirmo te*. The gifts given were the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Ghost. The Archdeacon of Sudbury regarded imposition of hands and unction as the outward signs and the strengthening by the Holy Ghost as the invisible grace. The Archdeacon of Nottingham considered the outward sign to be "imposition of hands, *i.e.* consignation," and that the gift is the sevenfold gift of the Holy Ghost specially to resist sin. The Precentor of York thought the same; the outward sign is the imposition of the bishop's hands as he signs with the chrism. The Chancellor of York gave a like reply, as did Dr. Marmaduke. The outward sign, the latter wrote, is imposition of hand and the sign of the cross with holy oil on the forehead, and the gifts given are the invisible graces of the Holy Ghost, especially consolation and strength.

Dr. Robinson, or Robertson (who was very evidently a man of considerable learning), held that the outward signs were prayer, imposition of hands, and the signing of the cross with oil on the forehead, and that the gift given was the power of the Holy Ghost to strengthen the receiver.

Dr. Richard Smith held the outward part to be the imposition of the bishop's hands and the unction of the chrism used therein. The gift was the sevenfold gift.

Dr. Buckmaster, who wrote at length about the signification of oil and balm, held the matter of the Sacrament to be the *consignatio* with unction and the form to be "Consigno te," etc. The Holy Ghost is given to worthy receivers.

The bishops and divines of the reforming school are on the whole much of the same opinion, though the Archbishop of Canterbury is somewhat detached. He replies merely: "The Church useth chrism for the exterior sign, but the Scripture maketh no mention thereof."

The Bishop of Ely replies that the outward sign is the imposition of hands or the anointing with chrism and the prayer. The candidates receive such graces as be necessary for them, according to the promise of Christ made to the Church.

The Bishop of Rochester answers less clearly. Holding that the present "holy Rite and godly Ceremony" was begun by the Holy Fathers to test the faith of those baptized as infants when they come to years of discretion "as my Lord of Hereford's booke," he thinks that "it should not be despised, but allowed and approved, although holy oil is used."

The Bishop of Bangor considers the outward sign to be unction with chrism and certain words. He finds no promise of grace attached to it in Holy Scripture; but the doctors teach that ghostly strength is given.

Of the divines, Dr. Barber holds the outward sign to be imposition of hands. Oil has been added, since it was used in baptism; but it is not of the essence of the sacrament. He believes that the Holy Spirit is given by these means, though there is no promise of such grace in Holy Scripture. But he thinks it most pious to hold that view. Dr. Edmunds replies that there is no matter nor form of the sacrament mentioned in Holy Scripture; but the doctors say that holy chrism, with the words "Consigno te," etc., are the outward signs, and though there is no promise of grace by our Lord in Holy Scripture, yet the doctors say that it confers strength against spiritual foes. But Dr. Edmunds insists that there is no promise made by Christ to those who receive Confirmation.

The anonymous divine, who holds a scholar-like and on the whole conservative position, considers that the outward sign is the imposition of hands, for that is expressed in Holy Scripture. Chrism has been added by the Fathers "for the good significance that oil hath in Holy Scripture." But the graces given are the gifts of the Holy Ghost, constancy, strength, and the like. The outward sign is imposition of the hand, with prayer by the bishop.

The answers to this question reveal a considerable amount of common ground between the two groups, only the most extreme on either side standing apart.

To the third question, which asked what promise be made that the said graces shall be received by this sacrament, the answers are less clear, and indeed it seemed to not a few that the question had been answered in their replies already given.

The Archbishop of York replies that the seven gifts given in Confirmation are by His promise by whom the Sacrament was instituted. He quotes the fourth Epistle of St. Clement and St. Dionysius, *De Ecclesiæ Hierarchia*, and concludes that the effect of the sacrament is strength to fight. It is a careful account of the Sacrament from the patristic sources then open to a scholar.

The Bishop of Lincoln replies that it has the promise of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, as St. Peter declared in his sermon in Acts ii, quoting Joel iii.

The Bishop of London alleges the acts and deeds expressed in the books of the Apostles, with the effects that followed laying on of hands, joined with Christ's promises to the Church, and "the continued belief of the same Catholic Church."

Dr. Wotton answers that his reply depends on his answers to the previous question. The Archdeacon of Gloucester's answer is defective in the text; he alleges the general promise of the Holy Spirit made to the Church and apparently goes on to instance other specific promises in Holy Scripture. The Archdeacon of Sudbury and the Precentor of York do not deal with the point. The Archdeacon of Nottingham alleges the general promise that Christ gives to His Sacraments, which is practically the reply given by the Chancellor of York. Dr. Marmaduke answers that Christ promises the Church to be with them, and for that promise as exemplified in Confirmation cites Acts viii and xix; the anonymous divine cites Acts viii, "supposing the Apostles executed that thing."

Dr. Robinson (Robertson) does not deal expressly with the point, but answers by anticipation the objection that the gift of tongues (as in Acts viii and xix) does not now follow the gift. Dr. Richard Smith replies that the promises attached to Confirmation were not made in writing, but were taught by our Lord to His Apostles and by them to the Church.

Dr. Buckmaster holds that though the external matter and form of Confirmation (as he has defined them) be not mentioned actually in Holy Scripture yet we ought reverently and obediently to accept and receive the same because "the Church, that is to say, the whole multitude of Christen people, hath so allowed them and received them hitherto." He quotes further Acts viii and xix, and holds that all Christian people after Baptism should " be presented to their bishops, that they, laying their hands upon them and consigning them with the holy chrism, should pray for them that they might be confirmed with the Holy Ghost."

The bishops and divines of the liberal group thus are not of one mind in their answers, and the reply of the Archbishop of Canterbury seems to answer the latter part of the previous, *i.e.* the second, question. The question appears as, " What is the efficacy of this Sacrament ? "[1] and the Archbishop answers : " The bishop, in the name of the Church, doth invocate the Holy Ghost to give strength and constancy, with other spiritual gifts, unto the person confirmed ; so that the efficacy of this sacrament is of such value as is the prayer of the bishop made in the name of the Church."

The Bishop of Ely answers very fully and clearly. He refers to his answers to the two previous questions, and adds that, although Confirmation as it is now used hath no special promise of God in Holy Scripture, yet it is certain that imposition of hands was a sacrament ministered by the Apostles to the baptized, and it was given not only to men of years and discretion, " but also to infants and younglings," following the example of the Lord, who laid His holy hands on the infants. Bishops are, he thinks, " the convenient ministers of this sacrament."

The Bishop of Rochester does not seem to deal with the point, while the Bishop of Bangor answers, as to the previous question, that there are no promises of such grace (*i.e.* ghostly strength, etc.), in Holy Scripture, but that the doctors write as he has stated in his reply to the second question.

Of the divines, Dr. Barber's answer is contained in his answer to the former question ; there is no certain promise of grace apparent in Holy Scripture, he thinks. The same is true of the answer of Dr. Edmunds ; briefly, he holds that there is no promise of grace by Christ in Holy Scripture.

Such were, broadly, the opinions of representative bishops and theologians of the English Church in a discussion on Confirmation in 1537. The debate of which it formed part resulted in the second formulary of the Faith put out under Henry VIII, viz. *The Institution of a Christian Man*, commonly called *The Bishops' Book*, issued in the latter half of 1537. This dealt, amongst other subjects, with the seven sacraments, and consequently with Confirmation, which appears as the third in order, following Matrimony and Baptism.[1]

---

[1] Parker Soc., edition of Cranmer's *Remains*, etc., p. 80.

Bishops and preachers are to teach how the Apostles, although they knew that all the baptized had received forgiveness of sins and "were replenished with abundance and plentifulness of the graces and gifts of the Holy Ghost; yet they used to go unto the people after they were baptized, and so by their prayer, and laying of their hands upon them, did give and confer unto them the Holy Ghost"; and as authority for this statement there is a reference to Acts viii and xix.

Further, "the holy Fathers of the primitive Church, taking occasion, and founding themselves upon the said acts and deeds of the Apostles," and considering that the baptized might and often did fall from grace, "thought it very expedient to ordain, that all Christian people should, after their baptism, be presented to their bishops, to the intent that by their prayers, and laying of their hands upon them, and consigning of them with the holy chrism, they should be confirmed—that is to say, they should receive such gifts of the Holy Ghost" as would stablish them in their baptismal grace and give them also grace of perseverance, as well as make them strong and hardy to confess their faith before persecutors and resist the world, the devil, and the flesh, and also to bear the cross of Christ, and further attain abundance of the other graces of the Holy Ghost.

Also bishops and preachers are to teach that "although it be well done that men do present their children unto the bishop, to receive at his hands the sacrament of Confirmation, when they be of so tender age, as commonly they be wont to do," yet it is not to be thought that Confirmation of infants is necessary for their salvation, but "dying innocent before they be confirmed they will attain everlasting life and salvation by the effect of the Sacrament of Baptism before received."

---

[1] *Formularies of Faith, Henry VIII* (1825), pp. 94-96.

In this formal statement the influence of the previous discussion is seen. The institution of Confirmation is ascribed not to our Lord, but to the Apostles, and its present form to "the holy Fathers of the primitive Church." Its outward sign is, evidently, prayer, with laying on of the bishop's hand, and consignation with chrism, and the invisible graces of the gift of the Holy Spirit so given are very fully declared.

But the ebb and flow of theological discussion continued; the book of 1537 was licensed only for three years, and in June 1540 preparations were made for the composition of a new formulary by the constitution of a new committee of bishops and divines divided into two parts, one to treat of doctrines, the other of ceremonies.

By the King's authority a paper of seventeen questions was circulated, dealing with the nature and number of the sacraments and the powers of bishops, priests, and kings.[1]

Questions 7 and 8 touch Confirmation. Question 7 asks:

> "What is found in Scripture of the matter, nature, effect, and virtue of such as we call the Seven Sacraments; so as although the name be not there, yet whether the thing be in Scripture or no, and in what wise spoken of?"

To this the Archbishop of Canterbury replies: "Of the matter, nature, and effect of the other three, that is to say, Confirmation, order and extreme unction, I read nothing in the Scripture as they be taken for sacraments."

The Archbishop of York, on the other hand, answers: "Of Confirmation, we find (*sc.* in Scripture) that the Apostles did confirm those that were baptized, by laying their hands upon them, and that the effect then was the coming of the Holy Ghost into them, upon whom the Apostles laid their hands, in a visible sign of the gift of divers languages, and therewith of ghostly strength to confess, following upon the same."

---

[1] The answers are preserved in two MSS., one in the B. Mus. (Cotton Libr. Cleopatra, E.v.f.53), and another at Lambeth Palace among the Stillingfleet papers. They are printed by Burnet, *Hist. of the Reformation*, Records, pt. i, bk. iii, no. 21, and pt. iii, bk. iii, no. 29, and by Collier (*Eccles. History*, Records volume, no. xlix (ed. 1841, ix. 175-241). See the note on them, with further references, in Cranmer's *Remains*, etc. (Parker Soc.), p. 115, note 1.

The Bishop of Rochester (Heath) holds that "there be also in the Scripture manifest examples of Confirmation," viz., that it was done after baptism by the Apostles, "*per manuum impositionem*." The Bishop of Carlisle (Aldrich) finds Confirmation in Acts viii and quotes Bede as saying that such laying on of hands is the office and duty of bishops. He quotes St. Jerome to the effect that in Confirmation the Church has kept this manner and form.

Of lesser divines, Dr. Cox, then Head Master of Eton, under Elizabeth Bishop of Ely, finds in Scripture that "it is also manifest that the Apostles laid their hands upon them that were christened"; Dr. Day, Provost of King's College, Cambridge, and later Bishop of Chichester, that "although the seven Sacraments be not found in Scripture expressed by name, yet the thing itself, that is, the matter, nature, effect, and virtue of them, is found there," among them "laying the Apostles' hands on them that were christened." Dr. Symons[1] thinks Confirmation is contained in Scripture. Drs. Tresham,[2] Leighton,[3] and Coren[4] agree. Finally, all, except the Bishop of St. David's (Barlow), agree that the nature and virtue of all the seven be contained in the Scripture, the bishop holding that only Baptism, the Eucharist, Penance, and Matrimony are to be found there.

The eighth question, "Whether Confirmation *cum chrismate*, of them that be baptized, be found in Scripture?"

---

[1] He is probably the Simon Symondes, who was Canon of Windsor 1535-1551, who held also the Prebend of Crackpole St. Mary at Lincoln, 1543-1551, and the Prebend of Hansacre at Lichfield, 1534-1546.

[2] William Tresham was Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, 1532-1547.

[3] Presumably Richard Layton, a chief agent in the suppression of the religious houses, who was Dean of York, 1539, till his death in 1544.

[4] Hugh Curwen, a Royal Chaplain, later Archbishop of Dublin, 1555-1567, Bishop of Oxford, 1567-1568.

was directly to the point, though it might seem to have been pretty thoroughly discussed before.

The Archbishop of Canterbury answered briefly that " Of Confirmation with chrism, without which it is counted no sacrament, there is no manner of mention in the Scripture."

The Archbishop of York answered, " We find Confirmation, *cum impositione manuum*, in Scripture as before; *cum chrismate* we find not in the Scripture, but yet we find chrismation with oil used even from the time of the Apostles, and so taken as a tradition apostolic."

The Bishop of London (Bonner) answers, carefully and thoughtfully, that he finds " in Scripture in many places *de impositione manuum*, which I think (considering the usage commonly and so long withal used) to be Confirmation; and that with chrism, to supply the visible appearance of the Holy Ghost, which Holy Ghost was so visibly seen in the primitive Church; nevertheless, for the perfect declaration of the verity hereof, I refer it to the judgment of men of higher knowledge in this faculty."

The Bishop of Rochester (Heath) replies that "Although Confirmation be found in the Scripture, by example, as I said before, yet there is nothing written *de chrismate*."

The Bishop of Carlisle (Aldrich) says that the holy doctors take imposition of hands upon them which were christened, whereof is written in the Acts, to be the same which we call Confirmation. As for chrism, it would seem from St. Cyprian that there is great ground for deriving it from Scripture, " though it be not manifestly therein spoken of."

Of the divines, Dr. Robertson[1] thinks the matter and effect of Confirmation, viz. the imposition of hands by the Apostles on the baptized, by which the Holy Ghost was given, is contained in Scripture. Chrism is not mentioned because the Holy Spirit's descent was marked by a visible sign. When that outward sign ceased the Church began to use chrism in its place.

Dr. Cox does not find any mention of chrism connected with laying on of hands in Scripture. With this, so far, Dr. Day agrees, but he finds imposition of hands upon the baptized "which ancient authors call confirmation; and inunction with chrism hath been used from the primitive Church."

---

[1] Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and later Dean of Durham.

Dr. Oglethorpe[1] replies that there is express mention of laying on of hands with prayer in Scripture which is called by the doctors confirmation. Holy chrism is an apostolic tradition, "as is plain from the ancient writers."

Dr. Redmayne[2] recognizes that the question is not a simple one. Imposition of the Apostles' hands on the baptized by which the Holy Ghost was given for confirmation of the baptized, is found in Scripture. Chrism is a tradition "deduced from the Apostles, as may be gathered by Scripture, and by the old authors, and the mystery thereof is not to be despised."

Dr. Edgeworth[3] holds the Sacrament to have two parts: one, the laying on of hands, is taken from Hebrews vi and Acts viii. The other, viz. chrism, is taken from the Fathers and the primitive Church. He refers to St. Cyprian, *Epistolæ*, lib. 1, ep. 12.

Dr. Symmons says briefly that Confirmation is found in Scripture, and that the use of chrism is gathered from the old authors.

Dr. Tresham replies to the same effect, but chrism "is a very ancient tradition, as appeareth by Cyprian, *de Unc. Chrism.*"

Dr. Leighton says Confirmation is found in Scripture, but not *cum chrismate*, though that was used "soon after the Apostles' time," as the cited authors prove.

Dr. Coren (Curwen) holds that the laying on of the bishops' hands, "which is a part of Confirmation, is plainly in Scripture"; unction with chrism, "which is another part, hath been observed from the primitive Church, and is called of St. Austin, 'Sacramentum chrismatis.'" He adds, a little irrelevantly, that "unction of the sick with oil, and the prayer, is expressly grounded in Scripture."

---

[1] Fellow and later President of Magdalen College, Oxford, preferred both by Archbishop Cranmer and Heath; consecrated Bishop of Carlisle in 1557, in which capacity he crowned Queen Elizabeth.

[2] Lady Margaret Professor at Cambridge, where he became, in 1546, first Master of Trinity.

[3] This was Roger Edgeworth, a former Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, Canon of Wells and of Bristol, and later Chancellor of Bath and Wells. A famous preacher.

The Archbishop of Canterbury sums up that all, except the Bishop of Carlisle, agree that Confirmation with chrism is not found in Scripture, but only "confirmatio cum manuum impositione," and "that also my lord of St. David's (Barlow) denieth to be in Scripture, as we call it a sacrament. My lord of Carlisle saith that chrism hath a ground to be derived out of Scripture. The others say it is but a tradition."

The discussion of the subject since the like debate in 1537 had evidently made clearer certain points about Confirmation; the laying on of hands is now taken, it will be observed, for the matter of the sacrament and chrism is admitted to rest upon the tradition of the Church.

The bishops who took part in the discussion were almost all men of some distinction. Archbishop Cranmer needs no mention. The Archbishop of York, Edward Lee, is less well known. But he was a holy man and learned, a theologian and acquainted with Greek and Hebrew. Bishop Bonner of London was an able diplomatist and a capable canonist, while of the others Heath, Bishop of Rochester, destined to become Bishop of Worcester and then Archbishop of York, was a scholar as well as a diplomatist who, in 1535, had won golden opinions from the Lutherans of Germany. The Bishop of Carlisle, Robert Aldrich, was a distinguished Cambridge scholar, Provost of Eton and a friend of Erasmus. The Bishop of St. David's (William Barlow), whose answers are not recorded in detail, was an author, and is said to have been a Doctor in Theology of Oxford.

The divines, as a whole, unquestionably represented the best learning and scholarship of their day.

Their conclusions did not see the light until 1543, when the book *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*, commonly called the King's Book, was published at the end of May. It possessed every authority which was then recognized in England, for it was formally approved by Convocation, it was introduced by a Preface by Henry himself as Supreme Head, and it had the sanction of Parliament.[1] It treats of Confirmation as one of the seven sacraments, though it appears now as the sixth in order, following Orders and preceding Extreme Unction. The Article differs only verbally from the Article in the Bishops' Book in its first two paragraphs, the third is a little shortened. But the teaching of both books is precisely the same. Briefly the Apostles used laying on of hands upon the baptized with prayer, by which act the Holy Ghost was given. The holy Fathers of the primitive Church continued this practice, with consignation with holy chrism, so that the baptized might be confirmed and strengthened. And finally men ought not to condemn this Sacrament, yet Confirmation is not essential to infants, for if they be " baptized and dying innocents " they will attain everlasting salvation.[2] One slight difference appears between the Article in this and that in the 1537 book; the Scripture references in the margin to Acts viii and xix do not appear in this formulary of 1543.

The Book of Ceremonies, usually known as the *Rationale*, which was apparently the result of the committee appointed at the same time as that which produced the *King's Book*, makes no explicit mention of Confirmation any more than it does of the rites of marriage, burial, or ordination, but it has an explanation of the hallowing of oil and chrism[3] which reflects, without repeating, part of the argument of the King in his *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum* of 1521.

Thus up to the death of Henry VIII in 1547, the doctrine of Confirmation had passed through a considerable process of criticism, and had on the whole emerged clearer and stronger.

Evidence for contemporary practice is less easy to find.

There is, however, a first-rate contemporary account in Cavendish's *Life of Wolsey*.[4] Cavendish tells how his lord, about the feast of St. Michael, 1529, took his journey from Scrooby to Cawood and "lay two nights and a day at St. Oswald's Abbey (Nostell), where he in proper person confirmed children in the church, from the hour of eight until twelve of the clock at noon. And, making a short dinner, resorted thither again as soon after one of the clock, and for weariness, at the last was constrained to call for a chair; and there confirmed more children from the said hour unto six of the clock towards night, or ever he could finish and make an end, the number of the children was such. That done he went to his supper and rested him there all that night. And the next morning he applied himself to depart towards Cawood; and or ever he went, he confirmed almost an hundred children more; and then rode his way from thence. And in his journey at a plain green a little beyond Ferrybridge, within a quarter of a mile, at a great cross made of stone, a number of more children, accounted by estimation to be about the number of five hundred; where he was fain to alight, and from thence never removed until he had fully confirmed them every one; and then took his mule and rode to Cawood."[1]

---

[1] 34 & 35 Henry VIII, cap. 1, cf. *L. & P. Henry VIII*, xviii, pt. 1, no. 534.

[2] *Formularies of Faith, Henry VIII*, pp. 289, 290.

[3] *The Rationale of Ceremonial* (Alcuin Club Collections), vol. xviii. p. 36.

[4] Printed in Wordsworth's *Ecclesiastical Biography* (2nd. ed. 1818), vol. i.

The large numbers on these occasions were certainly not due to any lack of bishops in the diocese of York, for in this year there were apparently three bishops suffragan resident in the diocese, viz. Matthew Mackerell, Bishop of Chalcedon and Abbot of Barlings, John Stanywell "episcopus Poletensis," Abbot of Pershore, and John Maxey, Bishop of Elphin, who was Prebendary of York and Southwell. The crowds of candidates do point, however, to the deep, popular belief in Confirmation, a belief which is illustrated later.

Some of the Reforming party, in their ribald abuse of this Sacrament, also throw some light on its practice. Thus Tyndale, in his *Obedience of a Christian Man*, 1528, jeering at superstitions, writes: "Yea, and of the very clout which the bishop or his chaplain that standeth by, knitteth about children's necks at Confirmation, what lay-person dare be so bold as unloose the knot?"[2]

This use of a fillet of linen put on after the chrism and worn for some days later is referred to in the coarse *Humble Supplication*, etc., of Thomas Becon (1512-1567), chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, written in the early years of Queen Mary's reign when the author was in exile abroad.

---

[1] *Life of Wolsey*, pp. 498, 499.

[2] *Works*, Parker Soc., i. 225.

Becon contrasts the practice ordered by the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552 with the customs restored by Queen Mary. Under the Prayer Books the child had to be taught the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Decalogue, and to answer questions contained in the Catechism. "But now the Papists say to such as are witnesses of the child's baptism, 'Ye are bound by the order of our Mother the holy Church to see that this child be confirmed so soon as is possible, or as soon as ye hear that the bishop cometh within seven mile of the town, without further delay.' Of the things contained in the godly catechism for the right institution of the child they make no mention. And what is the confirmation of the children that is used at this present, but plain sorcery, devilry, witchcraft, juggling, legerdemain, and all that naught is? The bishop mumbleth a few Latin words over the child, charmeth him, crosseth him, smeareth him with stinking popish oil, and tieth a linen band about the child's neck, and sendeth him home. O Lord God, what a Confirmation of a child's faith is this! Yea, rather what a delusion and mocking is this of the godly, ancient custom in confirming children."[1]

Tyndale, in his book already referred to, attacks Confirmation as he knew it and asserts that it was invented by the bishops after they had ceased to preach, "then feigned they this dumb ceremony of Confirmation, to have somewhat at the least way, whereby they might reign over their dioceses."[2] "Which Confirmation, and the other conjurations also, they have now committed to their suffragans," he adds. He argues that the laying on of hands "did neither help nor hinder," and in a further section attacks the use of "anointing" as "altogether unfruitful and superstitious." Further, he says, "I have known priests that have gone into the orders again supposing that they were not priests, because that the bishop left one of his ceremonies undone. That they call Confirmation, the people call bishoping. They think that if the bishop butter the child in the forehead, that it is safe."[1] For the last two sentences Tyndale was sternly rebuked by Sir Thomas More in his *Confutation*.[2]

---

[1] *Works* (Parker Soc.), vol. "Prayers, etc.," p. 234.

[2] *Obedience of a Christian Man*, in *Works* (Parker Soc.), i. 274.

The publication of the Prayer Book of 1549 marked a change in the practice of Confirmation. The service was in English, the unction with chrism was omitted, though the signing with the cross and the repetition of the Christian name were continued, and the Bishop was directed, after crossing the candidates on the forehead, also to lay his hands upon their heads. The title of the office, "Confirmation, wherein is contained a Catechism for Children," pointed to a new feature. The Office was preceded by a Catechism, "An Instruction to be learned of every child before he be brought to be confirmed of the Bishop." This was a following of current Lutheran practice, the Brandenburg Church Order of 1540 containing an Order for Confirmation by prayer and imposition of hands after instruction in the Catechism and examination by the bishop,[3] though Erasmus, in 1522, "had suggested the institution of catechetical instruction, and of a public profession of baptismal obligations on the part of children of competent age in the presence of the Bishop."[4] Erasmus "does not suggest that this ceremony should accompany Confirmation," though the presence of the bishop at it might seem to point to it.[5]

The 1549 Office is preceded by a short Preface, cast into the form of rubrics, which directed that none should hereafter be confirmed but such as could say the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Decalogue, and could answer such questions in the Catechism as the Bishop "shall by his discretion appose them in."

---

[1] *Obedience of a Christian Man*, p. 277.

[2] More, *Confutation*, etc., p. 41. See note 4 in Tyndale, *op. cit.* p. 277.

[3] Brightman, *The English Rite*, I, p. xli.

[4] *Ibid.* p. cxxi. The passage from Erasmus occurs in his preface to his *Paraphrasis in Matthæum.*

[5] Amos Comenius (1592-1671), the historian of the Moravians, regards the suggestions of Erasmus as founded on Moravian practice. It appears that Martin Bucer from 1520 at Strasburg had begun the practice of examining children as to their beliefs before Confirmation. The practice was in use by the Moravians in 1504, and appears to go back to John Hus, possibly to Wycliffe; see Lockton in *C.Q.R.*, April 1925, pp. 43-50.

For this three reasons are given:

(1) That children come to years of discretion may openly before the Church "ratify and confess" their baptismal promises (a section based on the *Consultation* of Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne).[1]

(2) Because Confirmation is administered to the baptized "that they may receive strength and defence against all temptations to sin," it is most meet to be administered when those temptations begin to be felt strongly (a paragraph based on the Canon Law).[2]

(3) Because "it is agreeable with the usage of the Church in times past, whereby it was ordained that Confirmation should be ministered to them that were of perfect age, that they, being instructed in Christ's religion, should openly profess their own faith and promise to be obedient unto the will of God."

The opening sentence of this last reason Dr. Brightman describes as "startling," and thinks it may possibly, though improbably, represent a misunderstanding of a passage in the Canon Law, though more likely it is meant to reproduce a passage in the *Consultation* or in the Brandenburg Church Order. But even so it is not "precisely true of the West, still less of the East." [3]

A further rubric repeats the statement from the Formularies of 1537 and 1540 to the effect that no harm shall come to children by deferring Confirmation, since baptized infants are "undoubtedly saved." Of two rubrics at the end of the office, one enforces upon the curate of every parish the duty of catechizing, once in six weeks at the least, on Sundays or Holy Days, half an hour before Evensong in Church. And parents, masters, and dames are to send their children, servants, and apprentices, who are not yet confirmed, to be so instructed.

The other bids the curate, when the Bishop has given notice of a confirmation, either to bring or send the names of all children in the parish who can repeat the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Decalogue. He is to add how many can answer questions in the Catechism.

---

[1] Brightman, *The English Rite*, II. 776. [2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Op. cit.* I. cxxi. See also Lockton, *C.Q.R.*, April 1925, pp. 51, 52.

Thus was laid down a regular system of preparation for Confirmation which has, with such slight changes as modern needs have occasioned, been followed ever since. The Catechism as put forth "is perhaps unique among manuals of the period in containing no treatment of the Sacraments." "Was it," asks Dr. Brightman, "that Cranmer did not know his own mind, or that agreement was found impossible in 1549?"[1]

The Office of Confirmation itself was practically the Sarum Office translated, save that the last prayer of the older service (which contained an allusion to the consignation with chrism) was replaced by a prayer composed from a long collect in Archbishop Hermann's *Consultatio*.[2] The old prayer for the sevenfold gift of the Holy Spirit which immediately precedes the laying on of hands, found in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, and in the earliest English Pontifical, that of Egbert of York, makes the meaning and object of the rite plain.

Two further rubrics of the office are noteworthy. One directs that the child shall be brought to the bishop by one that shall be his godfather or godmother, that every child may have a witness of his Confirmation; the other clearly indicates the position occupied by Confirmation in the Church's system. It runs: "And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion, until such time as he can be confirmed." This is taken directly from the rubric in the *Sarum Manual*, and repeats the provision of the English Canon made by Archbishop Peckham in 1281.[3]

The Office of 1549 is important because it has survived with comparatively little change through subsequent revisions of the Prayer Book, and it proved a stone of stumbling, if not a rock of offence, to those who in subsequent generations desired to loose the Church of England from its connexion with the past and set it free to follow the way taken by the pure Reformed Churches abroad.

---

[1] *The English Rite*, I. p. cxxii.

[2] The relation of the 1549 office to the Latin and the Reformed Cologne Order is plainly shown in a table in Brightman, *op. cit.* I. cxxii., and in detail II. 792-797.

[3] Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia*, i. 31, *cf.* Procter and Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer* (1902), p. 606 and note.

It did not long escape criticism from the Reformed standpoint. Martin Bucer, who had come to England at Archbishop Cranmer's invitation in April 1549 to be made Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, in answer to a request for his judgment on the Book of 1549, compiled his *Censura*, which was completed in January 1550-1551.[1]

Dealing with Confirmation, Bucer insists that children should not be admitted to it before they have proved by their life and conversation that they mean to live a godly life. Mere recitation of the Catechism is not enough; they must show signs of the fruit of the Spirit.[2] Further, he desires that the Bishops, if they cannot confirm annually, should delegate the right of confirming. Approved men are to be appointed in such cases, to visit and test the spiritual state of the candidates.[3] These suggestions illustrate their author's "inquisitorial instinct."[4] When the Second Prayer Book appeared in 1552 the Order for Confirmation underwent no drastic change, the prayer for the sevenfold gift was somewhat altered, the signing with the cross and the mention of the Christian name were omitted, and the indicative form "N., I sign thee with the sign of the cross and lay my hand upon thee. In the Name, etc.," was replaced by the precatory form which is still in use. Slight alterations laying further stress on learning the Catechism were made in the final rubrics, but for the rest the Service remained unchanged.

The Prayer Book of 1552 came into force on All Saints' Day of that year; on July 6, 1553, Edward VI died, and Queen Mary I's first Act of Repeal ordered that on and after December 20 following the order used in the last year of Henry VIII be used and frequented throughout the realm. The change in the matter of Confirmation would not have been considerable, it would mean that the chrism and the signing with the cross would be restored and that the service would be in Latin, and that, presumably, the tactual laying on of hands would be disused, though in fact it is probable that in the Sarum Office, thus restored, " the bishop laid his hand on the child's head, while anointing his forehead with the thumb of the same hand."[1] There is one fragment of evidence to show that Confirmation had, however, been practically neglected during Edward VI's reign, although the belief in it and the desire for it persisted notwithstanding the changes. This evidence is given by Bishop Jeremy Taylor in his *Discourse of Confirmation*, published in 1663. In his Introduction the Bishop tells how " Time was in England, ever since the first beginnings of Reformation, when Confirmation had been less carefully ministered for about six years; when the people had their first opportunities of it restored, they ran to it in so great numbers that churches and churchyards would not hold them; insomuch that I have read that the Bishop of Chester was forced to impose hands on the people in the fields, and was so oppressed with multitudes, that he had about been trod to death by the people, and had died with the throng, if he had not been rescued by the civil power."[2] For this story the Bishop refers to Franciscus Hallier's *Vindiciæ Ecclesiasticæ Hierarchiæ*. Its ultimate source, however, is that vigorous opponent of the English Reformation Nicolas Sanders,[3] whom Hallier was quoting. According to Sanders, during Edward VI's reign the sacrament of Confirmation was not duly (*legitime*) administered, therefore a vast multitude of children were not confirmed and the (*sc.* Marian) bishops were almost overwhelmed. Particularly the Bishop of Chester, while in Lancashire, was unable to cope with (*vim ferre*), let alone satisfy the crowds, and with great difficulty was rescued by the magistrates. The bishop was probably Dr. Cuthbert Scott, who, after being deprived of his see under Queen Elizabeth, died at Louvain in 1564, where Sanders's mother was residing, and where he himself was Regius Professor of Theology from 1565 to 1572. The Bishop of Chester from 1541 to 1554 was an ex-Carmelite, who, though deprived in 1554 as married, became in the same year Suffragan to Bishop Bonner of London, so that he cannot have been ignorant of the doctrine and practice of Confirmation, though he may have neglected to confirm in the period 1547-1553, as Sanders asserts. But that some at least of the Edwardian Bishops were concerned with Confirmation is clear from the Visitation Articles of Bishop Ridley for London in 1550 and Bishop Bulkeley of Bangor in 1551.[1] Bishop Ridley asks (Art. 42), " Whether the curate doth admit any to Communion before he be confirmed, or any that ken not the *Paternoster*," Creed, and Decalogue in English [2]; and Bishop Bulkeley inquires (Art. 32) whether the clergy instruct and examine in the Catechism children not confirmed and whether the parents and friends send such children to the catechizing.[3] The instruction is specially stressed, it will be noticed, and in Archbishop Cranmer's *Visitation* of 1548 Confirmation is not mentioned, though there is the inquiry (Art. 23) whether the curates have warned their people not to receive Holy Communion before they can say perfectly the *Paternoster*, Creed, and Decalogue.[4]

---

[1] It is printed in *Scripta anglicana* of Bucer (Basel, 1577), and summarized in Procter and Frere, *op. cit.*, pp. 73-76, and in Brightman, *The English Rite*, I. cxliii-iv.

[2] *Censura*, fol. 482.

[3] *Ibid.* fol. 486.

[4] Brightman, *op. cit.* I. p. cxliii.

---

[1] Pullan, *Hist. of the Book of C. P.* (2nd ed., 1900), p. 213. The learned Mr. Jackson, in his *History of Confirmation*, 1877, gives much evidence for his contention that from St. Cuthbert to the sixteenth century imposition of hands was the continuous practice of the English bishops (*op. cit.* pp. 59-63).

[2] *Works*, ed. Heber (London, 1839), xi. 231.

[3] In C. P. Eden's edition of Taylor's Works the reference is amplified to Hallier, *op. cit.* lib. ii., cap. 5, § 2, p. 125 (Paris, 1632) 4to e Sanders Schism, Angl. lib. ii. Even with this clue I searched in vain for the story. It is not in the English translation of Sanders by R. Lewis (1877) made from the 1585 edition, but it is found in the 1628 ed. (Col. Agrip. 12°) lib. ii. 246. I owe its ultimate discovery to the kindness of the Principal of Pusey House, Oxford, Dr. Darwell Stone.

The return to the unreformed practice under Queen Mary is marked by careful inquiry about Confirmation. In the Queen's *Articles* bearing date March 4, 1553, and sent to all bishops, Art. 14 orders "that children be christened by the priest, and confirmed by the bishop, as heretofore hath been accustomed and used."[1] Nothing is said about children confirmed under the rite of 1549, though the next injunction, Art. 15, bids the bishops supply what is wanted in those who have been promoted to any Orders "after the new sort and fashion of Order."[2] Probably the Edwardian rite was held sufficient, even though it lacked chrism.

---

[1] Printed in *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*, ed. Frere and Kennedy, ii., 1536-1558 (Alcuin Club Collections, vol. xv.). Bishop Bulkeley's articles are " based almost entirely on those of Ridley."

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 237.

[3] *Op. cit.* p. 265.

[4] Cranmer, *Remains*, etc. (Parker Soc.), p. 156.

Bishop Bonner, in his Visitation of his diocese of London, September 1554, asks (Art. 103) whether any lay person has refused to bring his child to be confirmed or dissuaded others from doing so, an inquiry repeated in part by Cardinal Pole in his articles for Canterbury,[3] May 1556 (Art. 50),[3] and again in 1557.[4] The questions suggest that persons of reformed opinions were declining to avail themselves of the form in use.

PERIOD 2, 1558-1597. FROM THE ACCESSION OF QUEEN ELIZABETH TO THE PUBLICATION OF THE FIFTH BOOK OF HOOKER'S "ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY"

In 1559 the restored Sarum use was again replaced by the Book of Common Prayer, in English, which, so far as the Order of Confirmation was concerned, was identical with the Order of 1552. Chrism and the consignation were once again omitted from the form prescribed. But there is evidence to show that the repetition of the Christian name and the signing with the cross were, in fact, continued in practice by some bishops for a generation and more. Thus Edmund Scambler, Bishop of Peterborough, writing in 1567, says, "I may not change usual or common names at the Confirmation, but only strange and not common; and further, if the name be changed at Confirmation, it taketh effect but from the Confirmation,"[5] and Edward Boughen, chaplain to John Howson, Bishop of Oxford, in a sermon preached at that prelate's primary Visitation in 1619 defended the signing in Confirmation as a well-known custom. He said, " The Cross, therefore, upon this or the like consideration, is enjoined to be used in Confirmation in the Book of Common Prayer set forth and allowed in Edward VI's reign. And I find it not at any time revoked ; but it is left, as it seems, to the Bishop's discretion to use or not to use the Cross in Confirmation."[1] In that respect the use of the cross would be akin to the use of the manual acts in the Consecration of the Eucharist, which from 1552 until their formal restoration in 1662 were used traditionally.

---

[1] Frere and Kennedy, *op. cit.* p. 328.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Op. cit.* p. 354, and p. 390.

[4] *Op. cit.* p. 425.

[5] Blunt, *Annotated Book of Common Prayer* (ed. 1884), p. 444, note 1.

The question of Confirmation seems involved in the *Interpretations* of the bishops, the document which represents the agreed policy of the episcopate in 1560–1561, where Art. 20 states that children are not to be admitted to the Communion before the age of twelve or thirteen years, of good discretion and well instructed before.[2] By the rubric of the office Confirmation was a necessary preliminary to Communion. In 1565 two bishops deal with Confirmation. Thomas Bentham, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, in Instructions issued to his diocese, charges his clergy " to make presentment of all children within their cures being full seven years of age and not confirmed " (Art. 3),[3] while Bishop Geste, in Injunctions to the diocese of Rochester, repeats (Art. 13) the direction of the *Interpretations* and adds (Art. 17) that none are to communicate who cannot say perfectly the Lord's Prayer, Creed, and Decalogue (thus repeating Cranmer's order of 1548).[4]

The Archbishop of York, Thomas Young, in his *Injunctions* of 1561, required his clergy to give in at every synod hereafter to be holden a list in writing of all parishioners who neglected to send their children, etc., to be catechized (Art. 3), and also forbade any to be admitted to Communion who had not been communicants previously, " except they be thoroughly instructed in the Catechism aforesaid, and be also confirmed according to the order prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer" (Art. 4).[1]

---

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 443.

[2] *The* " *Interpretations*," etc., ed. Kennedy, Alcuin Club Tracts, vii (1908), p. 32.

[3] Frere and Kennedy, *Visitation Articles*, etc. (Alcuin Club Collections, xvi), iii. 163.

[4] *Op. cit.* p. 161.

The doctrine of Confirmation in the Prayer Book of 1559 was plain; the rite was declared to be for strengthening of the baptized and for a defence against all temptations to sin; it was to be ministered by a bishop only, with laying on of hands, and immediately before that ceremony came an invocation of the Holy Ghost in His sevenfold gifts, a prayer, as has been said above, which had been in every Western Order for Confirmation. Further, Confirmation was declared necessary before first Communion. But such teaching did not well agree with the systems learnt by those Elizabethan divines who had been abroad in Queen Mary's reign; consequently soon after the book of 1559 had been authorized Calvinist teaching sought to minimize its doctrine of Confirmation, teaching which was substantially identical with that of the Church in the previous centuries.

Thus Thomas Becon, whose coarse *Humble Supplication* has been referred to above (p. 79), published in 1563 a short treatise on Christian doctrine, *The Demands of Holy Scripture*.[2] He declared that there be but two sacraments, since, according to his definition, a sacrament must have been instituted by our Lord, the rest be "honest trades, godly orders of life and virtuous, meet to be exercised of Christians, as matrimony," and the other four lesser sacraments. He treats them shortly, and to his own question, "What is Confirmation?" he answers, "A godly allowance by the bishop or preacher of the children when they come to age, into the congregation of Christ, after a due examination or trial of their continuance in the same faith which their godfathers or sureties in their name professed and promised for them at their baptism to keep. And this confirmation is, as it were, a discharge of the godfathers' bounds (*i.e.* bonds)."[3] Here is no suggestion of any gift of the Holy Spirit, and the minister of the rite may be "the bishop or preacher."

---

[1] From a copy of Abp. Young's Visitation Injunctions in the possession of E. W. Crossley, Esq., F.S.A.

[2] *Works*, vol. iii (Prayers, etc.), (Parker Soc.), p. 596 *seq.*

[3] *Ibid.* p. 618.

In 1565 James Calfhill, Archdeacon of Colchester and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, published an *Answer* to John Martiall's *Treatise of the Cross*. He is concerned to prove Confirmation "no sacrament." But he "allows" Confirmation "well; retaining that order, which in the primitive Church was, and in the English Church is, used: that children, after certain years, be presented to the bishop, and rendering an account of that faith of theirs (which by their sureties in baptism they professed), have hands laid on them; which is nothing else but prayer made for them."[1] To prove this last point he quotes St. Augustine.[2] He attacks the use of chrism with some profanity. "What promise have they of grace annexed unto their sacrament, unless they have shut the Holy Ghost in their grease-pot?"[3] and denies that Confirmation confers grace. He discusses Acts viii and asserts that by the gift of the Holy Ghost there given was meant the power to speak with tongues. He mentions Acts xix, but does not discuss it.

He certainly makes a point when he says that "neither Peter nor John anointed the Samaritans," but his position is that neither Acts viii nor xix refer to Confirmation. He scoffs at Martiall's contention that bishops alone may minister Confirmation, and seeks to prove his case by alleging that Ananias laid hands on St. Paul (Acts ix. 17). Calfhill further attacks the assertion that "seven-fold grace" is given in Confirmation.[4] "I beseech you show me the ground of your device." The author is more anxious to score points against his opponent than to exhibit what he held to be the true doctrine of Confirmation, but the impression he leaves is that he holds there is no gift of the Holy Spirit in the rite.

John Jewel (1522-1571), Bishop of Salisbury, was justly famous as one of the most learned of the Elizabethan bishops and as the apologist of the English Reformation. Beginning with a strong bias to Calvinism, he gradually won his way to a surer position. Jewel treats Confirmation in his *Treatise on the Sacraments,*[1] first published in 1583, twelve years after his death. He does not allow Confirmation to be a sacrament since it was not instituted by Christ, though, as he says in the previous paragraph, the difference about the number of the sacraments "standeth rather in terms than in the matter."[2]

---

[1] *Answer to Martiall* (Parker Soc.), p. 215.

[2] *De Bapt. contra Don.*, lib. iii, cap. 16 (ed. Bened. tom. ix. 79).

[3] *Answer*, etc., p. 216.

[4] *Op. cit.* p. 226.

Confirmation, he declares, "is so called because that which was done on our behalf in baptism is ratified and confirmed." He proceeds to give what can only be described as a purely imaginary, not to say mythical, account of the origin of the rite. Briefly, according to him, Christian children, having been religiously brought up, were brought to the church and by their parents presented to the bishop, "and yielded a reason of their faith openly before the whole congregation." Then "the bishop and all the people fell down on their knees and prayed unto God that He would continue the good thing He had begun; and the bishop, laying his hand upon them, commended them unto God. This was the ratifying of the profession which they made by others at their baptism, and for that cause called Confirmation."[3] Archbishop Cranmer, in the Preface to his translation of the *Catechism of Justus Jonas*, has a like account of "the ancient and laudable ceremony of Confirmation in" what he calls its "old state," when "an exact and strait examination was had of all such as were of full age" as to the profession they had made in Baptism together with "a general solemn rehearsal" of God's commandments and of the Creed.[4] Neither Cranmer nor Jewel give any authority for their accounts of this alleged primitive form of Confirmation, nor indeed could they have done so, for it is "a fond thing vainly invented." But it is strange to find so careful a scholar as Jewel falling into such an error.

Jewel, however, writes more strongly of Confirmation than does Calfhill. "I protest," he says, "that the use and order of Confirmation, rightly used, is profitable and necessary in the Church, and no way to be broken." But it is no sacrament, for it has no promise from Christ. "Otherwise being rightly used, it is a good ceremony, and well ordained of our ancient Fathers."

---

[1] *Works*, vol. ii (Parker Soc.).

[2] *Op. cit.* pp. 1102, 1103.

[3] *Op. cit.* p. 1125.

[4] Cranmer, *Remains*, etc. (Parker Soc.), p. 419.

The last words lead up to what is the acid test for the teaching about Confirmation, viz. the accounts in Acts viii and xix. For the Calvinist, it was vital to deny that these passages referred to Confirmation, since they pointed at least to its Scriptural origin and emphasized its objective side, viz. the gift of the Holy Ghost. Further, they afforded strong ground for the necessity both of the rite itself and of the Order to which its administration was, in the West, confined, viz. bishops. To insist on these points was to "unchurch" to that extent the Reformed abroad who lacked bishops and had dropped Confirmation. Bishop Jewel's Calvinism reacts to the test. The ice is thin, and he treads it softly, even to the extent of conflating the two passages of the Acts into one. Thus he writes: "The Apostles laid their hands on them, and confirmed them which were baptized of John. But that proveth not this confirmation: that was extraordinary; it was miracle." And he is assured of this because "the Holy Ghost doth not now descend in visible form upon those which are confirmed."[1]

For the rest, the bishop is concerned with what he considers the abuses of the old order: it was in a strange tongue, the children were too young to profess their faith, consignation and oil were used, Confirmation was held more honourable than Baptism. In these points he follows the order and the treatment of Calfhill, though without a trace of Calfhill's coarseness and profanity. The similarity of the argument throughout suggests that both were following some original; was it some lecture of Peter Martyr's at Oxford which had impressed itself on their minds, and of which both had kept notes? That Calvin's mythical origin of Confirmation did not entirely hold the field in the early period of the controversy is clear from Roger Hutchinson's *Image of God*, printed in 1550. Arguing against the Anabaptist teaching that sin after baptism cannot be forgiven, Hutchinson cites Heb. vi. 2 to show that in the primitive Church "men were first moved unto repentance, then unto faith in Christ, then sealed with the sacrament of Baptism, then confirmed with laying on of hands, and last of all certified of the resurrection and general judgment: and that all at the time of their christening."[1]

---

[1] *Works*, II. p. 1126.

Alexander Nowell (1507-1602), Dean of St. Paul's, published in 1570 his famous *Catechism*, which was at that time the only one authorized. He explains Confirmation on the basis of alleged primitive practice, viz. that children of Christian parents, after being trained "by means of little short books which we call Catechisms," were brought and offered to the bishop. The bishop questioned them, and such as he judged to have sufficiently understood their religion "he allowed (*eos approbabat*) and laying his hands upon them, and blessing them, let them depart. This allowance and blessing of the bishop our men do call Confirmation."[2] He goes on to describe and deprecate "another Confirmation, used of late," in which there was no examination, but which had an anointing of infants, a rite which was accounted a sacrament, equal indeed to Baptism, by some even accounted superior to Baptism. But it would seem that Confirmation, even as used in 1570, was not quite perfect, for the Master says: "It were to be wished, therefore, that the ancient manner and usage of examining children were restored again?" To which the Scholar has to reply, "Very much to be wished, surely."[3] This alleged ancient form of Confirmation here appears to be based on instruction for the catechumenate, and was, as Nowell admits, "before, or rather, at baptism." From the Preface to the English Translation by Thomas Norton, also printed in 1570, it appears that at Confirmation "the bishop which confirmeth doth not teach, but examine,"[4] as might be expected from the stress laid on the subjective and intellectual side of the rite.

In 1571 the Thirty-nine Articles, revised in 1563, underwent their final revision and were subscribed by the clergy in Convocation. Confirmation is dealt with in Art. xxv, where it is classed among the five " commonly called sacraments." It is not to be counted as a sacrament of the Gospel, and is, apparently, alleged to have grown either " of the corrupt following of the Apostles " or to be " a state of life allowed in the Church." Neither case covers Confirmation, and the clause is justly described as very carelessly drawn.[1] The Puritans at the Hampton Court Conference, 1604, pointed out that the phrase involved a contradiction with the teaching of the Prayer Book.[2] The Article had been drawn up in 1563, and was based in part on the *Homilies* set forth by authority in 1562, where absolution and " any other sacrament else " are declared to be not " such sacraments as Baptism and Communion are." Confirmation is called in the same place " Confirmation of children, by examining of their knowledge in the articles of the faith and joining thereto the prayers of the Church for them," [3] an explanation which certainly does its best to minimize the directions and words of the Prayer Book Office.

---

[1] Hutchinson's *Works* (Parker Soc.), p. 114.

[2] Nowell's *Catechism* (Parker Soc.), pp. 210, 211 (Latin, pp. 88, 89).

[3] *Op. cit.* p. 211 (Latin, p. 89).

[4] *Op. cit.* p. 109.

It was impossible to play with the Calvinist fire without sooner or later making a blaze. To vary the metaphor, the Prayer Book on Confirmation taught one thing, while various divines in high places were singing to it a descant which was in fact composed upon a different and more Protestant tune. At heart some of these higher clergy had no belief in Confirmation. At Frankfort, in 1555, four who later became English bishops or archbishops, Sandys, Grindal, Cox, Horn, with Becon and others, gave up freely " confirmation of children " together with Saints' Days, surplices, and the like rather than alienate or offend their brethren. They regarded these things "not as being impure and papistical," but as being "in their own nature indifferent,"[1] so they wrote to Calvin. But the rise of the Puritans brought matters to a head and exhibited, as Cartwright was swift to point out, the contrast between the teaching of the Prayer Book and the doctrine of its official teachers. Nowhere was that cleavage clearer than in the matter of Confirmation.

---

[1] Dr. Kidd, Warden of Keble, points out that if the Latin *partim . . . partim* be translated *some of them being*, etc., . . . *some of them being states*, etc., the two clauses will not then appear to cover the whole five, and the sense would be more exactly given (*The Thirty-nine Articles*, 2 vols. 1913, ii. 251, note).

[2] Cardwell, *History of Conferences*, p. 182. For Dr. A. J. Mason's suggested explanation of the phrase see Dr. Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles* (4th ed. 1904), p. 604, *n.* 1.

[3] *Certain Sermons and Homilies*, etc. (S.P.C.K.), 1851, p. 377, *Of Common Prayer and Sacraments.*

The coming crisis can be seen in a letter from Bishop Cox of Ely to Rudolf Gualter, the friend of Bullinger, in 1573. The bishop describes some in England, who amongst other points, "condemn the order of Confirmation, in which the bishops lay their hands upon the children on their repeating the Catechism, and pray the Lord that He may vouchsafe to increase in them the knowledge of His Word and godliness."[2] Gualter, as a moderate Calvinist, replies that he does not suppose that in the matter of Confirmation the bishop approves "that theatrical display" which Papists reckon a sacrament. "But if those who are rightly instructed in the Catechism are admitted to the Lord's Supper with public testimony and imposition of hands (which we know that Christ also practised to young children), I do not see what occasion there is for anyone to quarrel about it."[3]

But there was more in Confirmation as taught in England than Gualter supposed, and the quarrel had begun with the *Admonition to Parliament* (which had provoked Bishop Cox's letter) in 1572 and by a *Second Admonition* from the powerful pen of Thomas Cartwright. John Whitgift, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, answered the first *Admonition* and provoked a venomous *Reply to the Answer* from Cartwright himself. Whitgift replied with a *Defence of the Answer* in 1574, and in this work the doctrine of Confirmation is debated once more.

The *Admonition*[4] complained that Confirmation was ministered by the bishop alone, and as then used was "popish and peevish."[1]

---

[1] *Original Letters* (Parker Soc.), ii. 754.

[2] *Zurich Letters* (Parker Soc.), i. 281.

[3] *Op. cit.* ii. 233-4.

[4] Its authors were two London clergy, John Field and Thomas Wilcox.

Whitgift answered that Confirmation as now used is without all manner of superstition and in all points differs from the papistical manner of confirming children. For Confirmation by the bishop alone he quoted St. Jerome, *adv. Luciferianos*, and Bucer's *Preface to the Epistle to the Ephesians.*

Cartwright had retorted to this with effect, asking why there should be any such thing as Confirmation, since it was brought in by feigned decretals of popes and was not found in Scripture. Secondly, since it had been abused and was admittedly unnecessary, why was it not abolished? Thirdly, this (*i.e.* Anglican) Confirmation contained very dangerous points, viz. (1) the laying on of hands confirmed the idea that it was a sacrament, especially when the prayer said it was done according to the example of the Apostles, a statement manifestly untrue and "taken from the popish Confirmation." (2) The fact that the bishop alone ministered it suggested that it was superior to Baptism (which was ministered by priests) and further presented a practical difficulty, since men were forced to bring their children often half a score miles for a thing which, if it were necessary, could be done in their own parishes. (3) The Prayer Book also stated that "by the imposition of hands and prayer" the children "may receive strength and defence against all temptations," of which there was no promise in Scripture, and which maintained "the popish distinction" that the Holy Spirit was given at Baptism for remission of sins and in Confirmation for strength.[2]

Whitgift replied that Confirmation, "that is now used," was never abused by the Papists, for they never had it, nor anything like it. He gives in full the quotations from St. Jerome, *adv. Luciferianos*, and from Bucer, witnessing that this form of Confirmation was ancient. To the point that it was untrue to say that Confirmation came from the Apostles, Whitgift replied, rather feebly, "You only say it, you prove it not. Show the first institution of it since the

---

[1] Whitgift, *Works* (Parker Soc.), iii. 357.

[2] *Op. cit.* pp. 358, 359.

Apostles, and then you say something."[1] In answer to the further points he quotes St. Jerome and Bucer, as above, and urges that the argument about expense was childish. As for the ground of the promise, God does give such gifts to His true children in answer to prayer; imposition of hands is a sign of it.

Further Whitgift alleged that Calvin himself approved the imposition of hands in Confirmation, quoting the *Institutes*, bk. iv, ch. 19, § iv: "Such imposition of hands as is simply made in the stead of blessing I do commend, and wish that it were restored to-day to the pure use." That is the form and manner now used in the Church of England.[2] Cartwright retorted that though Calvin approved a kind of Confirmation, it was not the order in the Prayer Book. Calvin reproved St. Jerome for saying Confirmation came from the Apostles, and, for all his seeming to approve Confirmation, yet he abolished it in his own Church. Further, "the Churches of Helvetia, Berne, Tigurine (*i.e.* Zurich), Geneva, Scotland, and divers others" had abolished it.[3]

Whitgift denied that Calvin was inconsistent; what he disapproved was popish Confirmation; he approved the manner of Confirmation "which was used in the old Church," and the same that is now used in England, and he sets forth at length the passage from the *Institutes* in which Calvin describes what he considered to be the primitive Confirmation (which is, in fact, an account of the catechumenate, *i.e.* preparation for Baptism). This passage from Calvin is probably the original of the mythical account of Confirmation given by Cranmer, Jewel, and Nowell above.

He quoted Calvin as disapproving the later forms of Confirmation, and insists that the Churches of Helvetia, etc., speak only of "the popish Confirmation."

Finally, Whitgift approached Cartwright's point that the Papists and Anglicans assert Confirmation to be Apostolical, "grounding their opinion upon some dream of Hierome." Cartwright had added "as though baptism were not already perfect, but needed Confirmation, or as though the bishop could give the Holy Ghost."[1] Whitgift replied that St. Jerome's "dream may be of as much credit with wise men as your bare denial of the same." As for the next point, "Confirmation now used in this Church is not to make Baptism perfect," but partly to try how "the godparents have done their duty, partly that the children may "ratify and confirm" their promises, as is alleged "even in the book of Common Prayers." Further, the rubric declaring that baptized children dying before Confirmation are saved shows that Baptism needs no perfecting.

---

[1] Whitgift, iii. p. 360. [2] *Ibid.* p. 477. [3] *Ibid.* p. 478.

And, for the last point, the bishop may use the apostolic ceremony of laying on of hands "and may safely say this godly prayer: Defend, O Lord, this child," etc. There is no mention of any other giving of the Holy Ghost.[2]

Whitgift's arguments show the shifts to which a moderate Calvinist was driven by a more thorough-going one who confronted him with the words of the Prayer Book. He does not dare to defend Confirmation as apostolical with any proofs; he shelters himself behind St. Jerome, nor does he make successful reply to Cartwright's statement that the Prayer Book shows Confirmation to be a means of grace. He dwells, as a Calvinist needs must, on the subjective side and the ratification of the vows; but he defends the position of the bishop in the rite, grounding himself, not on Scripture, but on St. Jerome and Bucer.

The distinction between the "Popish" and the Anglican Confirmation may well have been a mere logical device; the plain fact was that the teaching of the Prayer Book Office was showing through the coating of Calvinism which had concealed it for some ten years past, much as a fresco, after a while, shows through whitewash. In fact, Confirmation was fast becoming a dividing line between the followers of Calvin and those who were finding his theology increasingly defective.

A certain amount of evidence for the practice of Confirmation during the years from 1559 to 1597, when a fresh period begins, is afforded by the Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the bishops and archdeacons; those of Bishops

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 493.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 494.

Bentham and Geste, and of Archbishop Young, which cover the period 1561-1565, have already been noticed,[1] two of whom refer by name to Confirmation. But in the great majority of such inquiries which are in print,[2] there is no such reference, but instead a constant reiteration of the direction that none are to be admitted to Holy Communion unless they can say the Lord's Prayer, Creed, and Ten Commandments, and, often, the Catechism. Possibly the Prayer Book rubric asserting the necessity of Confirmation before First Communion was held to be sufficient, but however that may be, the direction (which was contained in the address to the godparents at the end of Public Baptism) is continually repeated. None are to be suffered to come to Holy Communion unless they can repeat those three forms, so Bishop Parkhurst of Norwich orders in 1561.[3] Archbishop Parker at Canterbury, in 1563, inquires whether the ministers teach those forms as is prescribed in the Catechism.[4] Parkhurst at Norwich, in 1569, asks concerning the teaching of the Catechism and whether any parents, etc., do not send their children to be taught it.[5] Cox at Ely (*circ.* 1574) gives strict and detailed directions about catechizing. None above 20 are to be admitted to Communion who cannot say the necessary forms by heart, nor any between 12 and 20 who cannot say the Catechism.[6] Grindal, at York in 1571, inquires strictly to the same effect,[7] except that the age of 12 at Ely is raised to 14 at York; in his Injunctions of the same year he orders public catechizing every Sunday and Holy Day, the names of all between the ages of 6 and 20 who cannot say the Catechism to be taken, and certain to be called on each occasion "to come to the Catechism."[8] None are to be admitted to Communion over 24 who cannot say the forms, nor any between 14 and

---

[1] Above, pp. 87, 88.

[2] The bulk of this evidence is contained in the valuable collection of Injunctions and Visitation Articles, 1561-1730, printed as Appendix E, to the *Second Report of the Royal Commission on Ritual* (London, 1868), pp. 399-685; cited henceforward here as Appendix E.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 401, Art. 6.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 403, Art. 13.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 405, Arts. 10 and 22.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 406, Arts. 2, 3, and 5.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 408, Arts. 14 and 16.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 411, Art. 5.

24 that cannot say by heart the Catechism.[1] Archbishop Parker, at Winchester in 1575, inquires whether any notorious sinners or uncharitable persons or those who cannot say "without book" the necessary forms are admitted to Communion.[2] Archbishop Grindal, visiting the Province of Canterbury in 1576, inquires about catechizing: whether parents send their children, and whether any are communicated who cannot repeat the forms. He asks for the names of those between 14 and 20 who cannot repeat them.[3] Aylmer, at London in 1577, asks about catechizing each Sunday and Holy Day "for an hour at least"; how many above 7 and under 20 cannot say the Catechism; and whether any who cannot say the forms by heart are admitted to Communion.[4] Bishop Cooper's Visitation Articles for Lincoln in 1577 are not known to exist, but in his Injunctions which followed the Visitation the Bishop orders regular Sunday catechizing in Nowell's Catechism, forbids any between 6 and 20 to be admitted to Communion who have not been publicly examined and instructed. Confirmation is not named.[5]

The Articles of a Visitation for Worcester, ascribed to Whitgift in 1577, inquire about catechizing only,[6] but Bishop Barnes's Injunctions for Durham, in 1577, refer to Confirmation: "*Item*, we monish and straitly charge that none be admitted to the Holy Communion which are not confirmed and which cannot say the Catechism perfectly."[7]

Sandys, at York in 1578, inquires in strict detail about catechizing (Art. 12); all between 6 years and 20 are to come to learn the Catechism, and he asks for the names, ages, and addresses of all above 7 and under 20 who cannot say it. Further, whether any above 20 that cannot say the forms are admitted to Communion, or any between 12 and 20 who cannot say the Catechism.[8]

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 412, Art. 7.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 416, Art. 25.

[3] *Remains* (Parker Soc.), pp. 161-3, Arts. 13, 14, and 16.

[4] Appendix E, p. 419, Arts. 13, 14, and 16.

[5] Kennedy, *Elizabethan Episcopal Administration* (Alcuin Club Collections, vol. xxvi.), ii. 43, Arts. 8 and 9.

[6] Kennedy, *op. cit.* ii. 53, 54, 56, Arts. 7 and 14.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 71, Art. 4.

[8] App. E, p. 422, Arts. 12, 13, and 16.

Bishop Chaderton, at Chester in 1581, inquires about the weekly Sunday catechizing and whether any are admitted to Communion who cannot say the Catechism.[1]

Dr. Squier, Archdeacon of Middlesex in 1582, inquires strictly about catechizing the youth, and asks for the names, ages, and addresses of all above 7 who cannot say the Catechism and whether any who cannot say the forms are admitted to the Holy Communion.[2] Bishop Middleton of St. David's, in 1583, inquires about catechizing and whether there are admitted to Communion excommunicate persons or "any that are not catechized or confirmed." In his Injunctions he orders that no notorious offender, no infant under 14 years, no idiot, "Frenticke [fanatic] or others ignorant of the principles of the Christian religion and the doctrine of the sacraments" be admitted to Communion. Whether the unconfirmed were included under any of these categories does not appear.[3] Whitgift, as Metropolitan, at Bath and Wells, also in 1583 inquires strictly about catechizing only.[4]

Bishop Overton of Lichfield, in 1584, inquires about catechizing and whether any are admitted to Communion insufficiently catechized and unable to yield an account of their Christian faith[5]; the Archdeacon of London, John Mullins, in 1585, asks whether excommunicate persons, "young folk that cannot say the Catechism, or elderly folk that cannot say the Lord's Prayer," etc., or "being stained with any notorious vice," have been admitted to Communion.[6] But Bishop Aylmer at London, in 1586, after the inquiry about catechizing, asks whether any over 20 have been admitted to the Holy Communion that cannot say by heart the three forms in English "or be confirmed" (Art. 11).[7]

Other Visitation questions of this and the years immediately preceding and following it are silent about Confirmation. Thus, in 1585, Archbishop Whitgift at Chichester, *sede vacante*, inquires only about catechizing,[1] while Bishop Wickham at Lincoln and the *Orders for the Province of York* issued by Archbishop Sandys and his officials make no mention even of catechizing.[2] In 1586 Bishop Bickley, at Chichester, inquires about catechizing,[3] as does Bishop Westfaling at Hereford, the latter also asking whether any over 20 are admitted to Communion uninstructed in the Catechism and unable to say the three forms.[4] Bishop Wickham, at Lincoln in 1588, and again in 1591, inquires in Bishop Westfaling's words about catechizing and admission to Communion,[5] and Archbishop Whitgift, in 1589 at Salisbury, as Metropolitan in Articles which he used on eight subsequent occasions up to 1600, inquires about catechizing only[6]; Bishop Scambler, at Norwich in the same year, issued Orders for his clergy which strictly enjoin catechizing the youth.[7] In 1590 Archbishop Piers, visiting his Province of York, asks whether the uninstructed are admitted to Communion, and about catechizing[8]; while in the Orders for the Province, issued in 1591, catechizing with "all painful diligence" is prescribed.[9] But, for the most part, the Bishops, in their inquiries at this period, give an impression of being preoccupied with Roman Catholic missionaries.

---

[1] Kennedy, *op. cit.* ii. 113, 114, 119, Arts. 10, 13, and 33.

[2] Appendix E, p. 425, Arts. 11, 12, 13, and 22.

[3] His Visitation Articles are in Kennedy, *op. cit.*, iii. 140, Arts. 8 and 9; the Injunctions in Appendix E, p. 426, Arts. 3 and 10.

[4] Kennedy, *op. cit.* iii. 154, Art. 1.

[5] Appendix E, p. 428, Arts. 4 and 5.

[6] Kennedy, *op. cit.* iii. 179.

[7] Appendix E, p. 431, Art. 11.

The absence of any mention of Confirmation in these forms between 1565 (Bishop Bentham at Lichfield) and 1577 (Bishop Barnes at Durham), may point to the fact that Confirmation was so habitual that an inquiry would have been otiose, and that not until Puritanism began to gain ground was it necessary; on the other hand, the absence of any mention of Confirmation may suggest that the bishops whose inquiries and injunctions survive did not regard it as of great importance. The fact that Bishop Aylmer, of London, did not in 1577,

---

[1] Kennedy, *op. cit.* iii. 183, Art. 3.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 186–198.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 211, Art. 12.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 223-225, Arts. 8, 9, and 20.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 243-4, Arts. 18 and 19, also p. 265.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 248, Art. 9.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 256, no. 8.

[8] *Ibid.* pp. 259, 261, Arts. 4, 5, and 24.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 266, no. 2.

47,465

and neither through his Archdeacon nor himself[1] in 1582, nor through his Archdeacon in 1585, inquire about it, yet did so inquire in 1586, lends some support to the view that until that date no such inquiry was needed in London. On the other hand, a grave letter from Archbishop Whitgift to the bishops of his province in September 1591 on their neglect of Confirmation may well point to the other conclusion which other facts also support. The Archbishop attributes much of the dissoluteness in manners and ignorance among "the common sort" to the neglect of religious instruction. These evils might be redressed if catechizing on Sundays and Holy Days were carefully maintained and if every minister obeyed the direction of the Prayer Book, to give a charge at the end of the office of Baptism that the children be brought to the bishop to be confirmed so soon as they have learnt the Creed, etc., and the Catechism (the direction was, in 1662, turned into the final clause of the address to the godparents), "which giving charge, I do hear, is for the most part omitted. This ancient and laudable ceremony of confirming children . . . hath heretofore wrought much good where it was used. I am very sorry to hear that my brethren, the bishops of my province of Canterbury, do so generally begin to neglect to confirm children, at least to call for, and exact the use of both it and catechizing." He urges the bishops, very strongly, to see that catechizing is done, and that the charge about Confirmation is given at baptism, and requires them to warn the clergy to see that children who can say the Catechism are brought to Confirmation, not only when the bishops visit triennially, but also "when you travel abroad in the diocese to preach, and on market days when you reside and make your abode in any market-town."[2] But the Visitation inquiries and Injunctions which followed the Archbishop's letter exhibit no immediate change. In 1593 the Archdeacon of Oxford[3] and Bishop Fletcher at

---

[1] The very short Articles of Bishop Aylmer's Visitation in 1582 ask, in their 7th Article, "if the youth be not catechized" (Kennedy, *op. cit.* ii. 135).

[2] Whitgift, *Works* (Parker Soc.), iii. 610, 611.

[3] Kennedy, *op. cit.* iii. 268, Art. 2.

Worcester[1] are concerned only with catechizing. Bishop Fletcher's Articles for London in 1595 do not even mention this, but they exist only in a fragment.[2] Archbishop Whitgift's own Articles for his deanery of Shoreham in 1597[3] and those of Bishops Chaderton for Lincoln[4] and Bancroft for St. Paul's[5] in 1598, all inquire about catechizing, Bancroft being concerned for the choristers of the cathedral. But Confirmation is not so much as once named, though Bishop Chaderton's inquiry concerning "the orders, rites, and ceremonies" prescribed in the Prayer Book Office for Baptism[6] may refer to it, since among those orders was the direction to the godparents to see that the child was confirmed.

The neglect of Confirmation by the Elizabethan bishops was used against them by the Puritan, Robert Cawdry, Rector of South Luffenham, in a letter to Lord Burghley, dated March 22, 1587. Cawdry wrote that the bishops "themselves, for the most part, these twenty-nine years, had not observed it" (the Prayer Book) in various matters which he notes, one being "in not confirming of children as the book appointed,"[7] and the most impressive witness to the same neglect is borne by Hooker in 1597, who on this point "allows himself to speak of his ecclesiastical superiors with a severity unusual in him, but not unjust."[8] Hooker writes that there is "surely great cause to make complaint of the deep neglect of this Christian duty [*i.e.* confirming children] almost with all them to whom by right of their place and calling the same belongeth. Let them not take it in evil part, the thing is true, their small regard hereunto hath done harm in the Church of God. That which error rashly uttereth in disgrace of good things [*i.e.* the Puritan attack on Confirmation] may peradventure be sponged out, when the print of those evils, which are grown through neglect, will remain behind."[9]

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 271, no. 2.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 280, 281.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 289, Arts. 14 and 15.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 301, Arts. 19 and 20.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 306, Art. 6.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 301, Art. 22.

[7] Strype, *Life of Bishop Aylmer*, p. 89.

[8] Bishop F. Paget, *Introduction to Hooker*, bk. v. (2nd ed., 1907), p. 217.

[9] *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. v. ch. lxvi, § 8, in *Works*, ed. Keble (2nd ed. 1841), ii. 345, 346.

"The print of those evils," in Hooker's phrase, may be seen in Cawdry's letter already noticed. Cawdry insists that by neglecting Confirmation the bishops themselves forced the clergy to disobey the Prayer Book, for "by that order" (the Prayer Book) the clergy were "charged, that they should not admit any to receive the Communion until such time as they were confirmed by the bishop. Whereby they fell into two extremes, either to offend God, or the book: for if they were able to examine [*sc.* the children] themselves, and give a reason of their faith, they, the ministers, might not deny them the Communion; but the book said otherwise. Now seeing they (the bishops) omitted this [*i.e.* to confirm] because they knew it was a Popish ceremony, and not warrantable by God's Word," he demanded why the bishops dealt hardly with those who left out ceremonies even "more superstitious and offensive."[1]

Very largely this neglect was due to the cause already noticed, the prevalence of Calvinist opinions. Whitgift, in his reply to Travers, was handicapped by his subservience to Calvin, though he was, as his argument shows, in process of freeing himself. A far more complete breaking of the chains occurred when Richard Hooker, then Vicar of Boscombe, and Prebendary of Salisbury, published, in 1594, the first four books of his work, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, and in 1597 the fifth book.

PERIOD 3, 1597-1633. FROM THE PUBLICATION OF THE FIFTH BOOK OF HOOKER'S "ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY" TO THE PRIMACY OF ARCHBISHOP LAUD

How completely Hooker released the argument from the Calvinist domination, how much wider is his sweep and how much broader his range, can be seen very plainly if his argument about Confirmation is compared with that of Whitgift in his *Defence of the Answer* in 1574. Since both Whitgift and Hooker are answering exactly the same book and dealing in order with precisely the same questions, the comparison is very easy, and the difference between the two is immediately evident. Hooker appeals to Scripture and to reason and to the Fathers with a Catholic freedom which is in clear contrast with the silences and hesitations of Whitgift when Cartwright is showing that the Prayer Book is contrary to Calvin's *Institutes* and the Calvinist practice.

---

[1] Strype, *Life of Bishop Aylmer*, pp. 89, 90.

Whitgift's defence of Confirmation was, it is true, an advance on Jewel, just as Jewel was an advance on Becon and Calfhill; but Hooker sails out upon the wide ocean of Scripture and Christian history, while his immediate predecessors hardly dared to venture much beyond the narrow bounds of the Calvinist lagoon. To appreciate to the full the Catholicism of Hooker, it is necessary to read his works side by side with those of the Anglican controversialists, like Whitgift, who preceded him.

Hooker opens his chapter on Confirmation[1] by declaring that the ancient custom of the Church was to add to Baptism imposition of hands, with prayer for the Holy Spirit, to confirm and perfect the grace already begun in Baptism, a statement which traversed directly the assertion of Whitgift that Confirmation " now used " is not to make Baptism perfect.

Prayer is the means to obtain grace, to pray for others is to bless them. With prayer and benediction imposition of hands has been used in all ages to show " our restrained desires " towards others. He instances Jacob blessing Joseph's children, Naaman's expectation of such a ceremony from Elisha, and our Lord's use of the ceremony (§ 1).

After the Ascension, the prayer and imposition of hands of the Apostles " were a mean whereby thousands became partakers of the wonderful gifts of God," and he quotes the promise in St. Mark xvi. 9. Though in a manner all believers at the first had this power, yet only the Apostles had power to communicate it to all other men. Hooker bases this on Acts viii and xix, passages of Scripture which no Anglican divine had ventured to quote in such a connexion since the King's Book of 1543.

Hooker next (§ 3) points out (quoting St. Irenæus) that miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit continued after the Apostles' times, but it nowhere appears that any but bishops communicated such power.

---

[1] *Eccles. Polity*, bk. v. ch. lxi.

This power continued but for a time (as St. Augustine says), but Confirmation hath always continued "for other very special benefits which the Church thereby enjoyeth. The Fathers everywhere impute unto it that gift and grace of the Holy Ghost" which "assisteth us in all virtue, armeth us against temptation and sin." He quotes strong passages from Tertullian and St. Cyprian and Eusebius Emisenus to prove this point, and sums up: "The Fathers, therefore, being thus persuaded, held Confirmation as an ordinance apostolic always profitable [he refers to Hebrews vi. 1, 2] in God's Church, although not always accompanied with equal largeness of those external effects which gave it countenance at the first" (§ 4).

In his next three sections Hooker deals with the reasons for the severance of Confirmation from Baptism, citing again Acts viii as an account of Confirmation, and St. Cyprian's comment, showing that bishops ministered the rite (§ 5). The treatment of those baptized and confirmed by heretical bishops leads him to quote the passage of St. Jerome against the Luciferians (§ 6). One reason for the severance of Baptism and Confirmation was that it gave an opportunity to "the prelates and fathers of God's family" to examine the faith of those baptized in infancy and give them fatherly encouragement and exhortation (§ 7).

Lamenting the neglect of Confirmation by the bishops (§ 8), he deals rather scornfully with Cartwright's later points. According to the Puritans Confirmation "is found at the length no such profitable ceremony as the whole silly Church of Christ for the space of these sixteen hundred years hath through want of experience imagined," and Hooker states with like sarcastic humour the alleged "cruelty" to "poor country people" who must let their ploughs stand still and "with incredible wearisome toil of their feeble bodies" wander "over mountains and through woods" possibly "a whole 'half-score' of miles" all for a bishop's blessing. He proceeds to treat these objections with an irony worthy of William Law. To the first, that to pretend that the laying on of hands is done in example of the Apostles is a manifest untruth, he replies that " all the world doth know that the Apostles did never after baptism lay hands on any, and therefore St. Luke which saith they did was much deceived," and if by so doing " we thereby teach men to think laying on of hands a sacrament," then it must be because by the light of nature men think " all things done by Apostolic example must needs be sacraments."

To the second, that by confining the right to confirm to bishops, baptism is depreciated, he answers again, much in the manner of Law, " Will any man think that a velvet coat is of more price than a linen coif, knowing the one to be an ordinary garment, the other an ornament which only sergeants-at-law do wear ? "

To the third, that the Prayer Book's statement that by imposition of hands and prayer children may receive strength has no warrant of Scripture, Hooker answers, no more warrant than the Apostle had " by the bowing of his knees to God " (Eph. iii. 14), and, as for the dangerous word " strength " used in this connexion, Hooker sarcastically replies that we maintain " with ' popish ' Evangelists an old forlorn ' distinction ' of the Holy Ghost bestowed upon Christ's Apostles before His ascension into heaven (St. John xx. 22), and ' augmented ' upon them afterwards (Acts i. 8)," a distinction infused by degrees into Christians, planted at baptism and afterwards cherished, watered, and strengthened as by various other means, so by " this very special benediction whereof we speak, the rite and ceremony of Confirmation " (§ 9).

Such is Hooker's great contribution to the debate. There is no insistence, barely a mention, of the " examination " of candidates, no word about ratification of the vows or of the release of godparents from their obligations, on which the writers of the previous generation laid such stress. The fiction of a " primitive " form of Confirmation, akin to the Anglican but different in all points from the " popish " ceremony, has disappeared ; instead of it are the passages of Holy Scripture, Acts viii and xix and Heb. vi. The patristic appeal is far more thorough than in any previous writer, and at last the teaching of the Prayer Book about

Confirmation on its objective side, as the gift of the Holy Spirit by the laying on of the bishop's hands, was not merely exhibited but based on Scripture and on history.

In his seventh book, first printed in 1662, sixty-two years after the writer's death, Hooker, treating of the power which has belonged always unto bishops only, says that he does not include within it the power to confirm, because in some places presbyters might confirm in the absence of a bishop, "albeit for the most part none but only bishops were thereof the allowed ministers."[1] His authority is a commentary ascribed to St. Ambrose on ch. iv of the Epistle to the Ephesians.[2]

Archbishop Whitgift's anxiety, and doubtless Hooker's book, bore fruit in the Canons of 1603. Canon 60 (*Confirmation to be performed once in three Years*) declares that "it hath been a solemn, ancient, and laudable custom in the Church of God, continued from the Apostles' times, that all bishops should lay their hands upon children baptized and instructed in the Catechism of Christian Religion, praying over them and blessing them, which we commonly call *Confirmation*, and that this holy action hath been accustomed in the Church in former ages to be performed in the bishop's visitation every third year; we will and appoint, That every bishop or his suffragan, in his accustomed visitation, do in his own person carefully observe the said custom. And if in that year, by reason of some infirmity, he be not able personally to visit, then he shall not omit the execution of that duty of Confirmation the next year after, as he may conveniently."

Canon 61 dealt with preparation for Confirmation.

Every minister having cure of souls, "for the better accomplishing of the orders prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer concerning Confirmation," is to be careful to present no candidate but such as can give an account of their faith according to the Catechism. When the bishop gives notice of a Confirmation, "every such Minister shall use his best endeavours to prepare and make able, and likewise to procure as many as he can to be then brought and by the Bishop to be confirmed."

---

[1] *Works*, ed. 1841, iii. 170, bk. vii. ch. vi, § 4.

[2] The reference is given by Keble to § 9 of Appendix 241 of the Benedictine edition of St. Ambrose.

Here again the teaching of the Prayer Book about the Apostolic origin of Confirmation was insisted upon and the practical directions of the Book very firmly supported.

Another Canon of 1603, Canon 112, has some bearing upon the age for Confirmation, since it requires every parishioner of 16 years old who has not communicated at Easter to be presented to the bishop. "With triennial visitations this would mean that they might receive at 12 or 13."[1] By the *Interpretations of the Bishops* of 1560 no one might communicate "before the age of 12 or 13 years."

But the Calvinist view was strong; its supporters printed and circulated copies of the Prayer Book altered to suit their opinions. A Prayer Book of 1578 varies from the authorized book, among many other respects in omitting the Order of Confirmation; the rubric pertaining to it at the end of Public Baptism and Confirmation is alluded to in a rubric before the Catechism, "but it is not said to whom the child must be brought for that purpose."[2] A later form issued in 1589, though it restored some portions omitted, does not replace the Order of Confirmation.[3]

On the accession of King James I the Puritans in the Church asked, in the Millenary Petition, in the first article, that, with other things "Confirmations, as superfluous," might be taken away,[4] and at the Hampton Court Conference of 1604 Confirmation was one of the three points in the Prayer Book proposed by the King to the bishops, and it was understood to be agreed that "the Confirmation shall be called, The Confirmation or further examination of children's faith."[5] Later the Puritan divines "named divers abuses, but insisted chiefly upon *Confirmation*, the *Cross* in Baptism, the *Surplice*," etc.[6]

---

[1] Bishop A. C. A. Hall, *Confirmation* (1900), p. 106.

[2] *Liturgical Services, Q. Elizabeth* (Parker Soc.), Preface, pp. xv, xvi.

[3] *Ibid.* p. xvii.

[4] Cardwell, *Hist. of Conferences* (2nd ed., 1841), p. 131.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 141.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 163, quoting the account by Tobias Matthew, Bishop of Durham.

In his discussion with the bishops, the King betrayed his Calvinist training, arguing first about the name, which suggested that the rite was a confirmation of Baptism, as if that sacrament without it would be of no validity: a position he considered blasphemous. Secondly, he held its value to be that those baptized as infants should be examined when they came to years of discretion and be blessed by laying on of the bishop's hands. He abhorred its "abuse in popery, where it was made a sacrament and a corroboration to Baptism."[1]

In reply, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Whitgift) showed the antiquity of Confirmation "as being used in the Catholic Church ever since the Apostles' time, till that of late some particular churches had unadvisedly rejected it," a statement which shows how very thoroughly he had been convinced by Hooker. Next, the Archbishop strongly denied that the Church of England held or taught that Baptism without Confirmation was "unperfect" or that Confirmation added to the virtue and strength of Baptism, arguing from the rubrics "in the Communion Book."

The Bishop of London (Bancroft) followed, showing that Confirmation did not depend on primitive practice alone (which, however, he showed from St. Cyprian and St. Jerome), but that it was "an institution apostolical, and one of the particular points of the Apostles' catechism, set down and named in express words, Heb. vi. 2, and so did Master Calvin expound that very place, who wished earnestly the restitution thereof in those reformed Churches where it had been abolished."

The Bishop of Carlisle (Henry Robinson) "gravely and learnedly" urged the point of Heb. vi. 2, and the King, having called for a Bible and read the passage, approved the exposition.

The Bishop of Durham (Tobias Matthew) urged the passage in St. Matthew (xix. 13-15) where our Lord laid hands on children; and the conclusion was "for the fuller explanation, that we make it not a sacrament, or a corroboration to a former sacrament," and that the bishops would consider whether it might not, "without alteration (whereof his Majesty was still very wary) be entitled an Examination with a Confirmation."[1]

---

[1] Dr. Barlow's account of the Conference in Cardwell, *op. cit.* p. 172.

Throughout this discussion Confirmation is based upon the foundation to which Hooker had restored it, Scripture and the tradition of the Church.

The Puritan doctors, when their turn came, asked, through Dr. Reynolds, their spokesman, for an alteration, amongst other things in the Articles, especially noting Art. 25, where Confirmation was said to have "grown partly of the corrupt following [of] the apostles," which contradicted the words of the prayer in the Confirmation Service, "upon whom, after the example of the Apostles, etc." The first place confessed Confirmation, he said, "to be a depraved imitation of the Apostles," the second grounded it on their example, Acts viii and xix; and to this he also objected, for it made "as if the bishop, in confirming of children, did, by his imposing of hands, as the Apostles in those places, give the visible graces of the Holy Ghost."[2] He desired the contradiction considered and the ground alleged for Confirmation examined.

The Bishop of London interrupted the speaker at this point, and the objections were considered, the King deciding that the point about Article 25 was "a meer cavil."[3] The question of the ground for Confirmation being considered, the Bishop of London urged that the Scriptural basis was chiefly Heb. vi. 2, where he asserted, as before, that it was made "a part of the Apostles' catechism," which was the opinion, besides the judgment of the Holy Fathers, of Master Calvin, commenting on Heb. vi. 2, and of Dr. Fulke on Acts viii. 27. The Bishop asserted that the real objection of the Puritans was that each pastor could not confirm. Dr. Reynolds agreed that in large dioceses it was inconvenient that the bishop alone could confirm, for he could not possibly examine all the candidates.

The Bishop of London told the King, in reply, that the bishops appointed their chaplains and others to examine the candidates, and that they lightly confirmed none, save on the testimony of their own parsons, who knew them. On the doctrinal point that, according to the Fathers, Confirmation belonged to bishops alone, he quoted St. Jerome, "though otherwise no friend to bishops."

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 173.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 179.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 182.

The Bishop of Winchester (Bilson) challenged Dr. Reynolds to show where in ancient times Confirmation was administered by any but bishops, and said the rite was used partly to examine children, and then to bless and pray over them, partly to see whether they had been baptized with the right form or no. For in old days Baptism had been given "in divers sorts," so that catholic bishops were compelled to examine those who had been baptized.

The King concluded this point by rebuking St. Jerome for saying "that a bishop was not *divinæ ordinationis* (the Bishop of London thereupon inserting that, unless he could prove his ordination lawful out of the Scripture, he would not be a bishop four hours)," and closed it with the famous aphorism[1] "No bishop, no king."

Further, King James thought it consorted ill with the authority and decency of Confirmation that every ordinary pastor should do it; he meant not to take it from the bishops, seeing "that none should confirm without the bishop's licence, as none should preach without his licence"; but he was willing, if it were thought fit, that the word *examination* be added to the title of the Service.[2]

Later in the Conference the King agreed with the Puritan complaint that the Catechism was too short.[3]

The result of the Conference, so far as Confirmation went, was that the title of the Order for it in the Prayer Book was altered to "The Order of Confirmation, or laying on of hands upon children baptized and able to render an account of their faith, according to the Catechism following," and further, the explanation of the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion was added to the Catechism.

Also "the Rubric before the act of Confirmation" was altered from "Confirmation" to "Confirmation, or Laying on of hands."[4]

Possibly another result can be seen in the fourth of the five Articles submitted by James I to the General Assembly held at Aberdeen in 1616. Refused in that year, they were

[1] Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 183.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 184.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 187.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 220, 221.

passed in 1618 at the General Assembly at Perth. That Article runs: "Since Confirmation is most necessary for the education of youth, and may be brought back to primitive practice, it is ordained that the minister in every parish shall catechize all children of eight years old; and when they are instructed to repeat the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and Ten Commandments, with the answers to the questions contained in the small Catechism, that then the respective bishops shall order the children to be brought to them, and give them their blessing, with a prayer for increase of grace and knowledge."[1] There was little opposition to this (and the other Articles) at the time; though effective and successful resistance came twenty years later. The objection then made to Confirmation (or Bishoping) was that it became virtually a sacrament.[2]

The grasp which the Calvinist opinions still held at this period is shown in the treatise on the Thirty-nine Articles by Thomas Rogers, Rector of Horningsheath, Suffolk, and Chaplain to Archbishop Bancroft. In its original form the book had been published in folio in 1579-1585, and had offended not only "Papists and Schismatics" but also "many Protestants of a middle temper."[3] Rogers in some directions altered his outlook; in 1607 the book was issued in quarto and was reprinted in 1621, 1629, 1633, 1658, 1661, and 1691. Its author died in 1616.

Confirmation is dealt with under Article 25 and is treated under the proposition, "Confirmation is no Sacrament."

"Rightly used, as it was in the primitive Church, it is no sacrament; but, as part of Christian discipline, profitable for the whole Church of God."[4]

This view seems to be based on the imaginary account of "ancient Confirmation" invented by Calvin. "Popish Confirmation is repudiated, and the rest of the treatment of the subject is concerned with it. "The synagogue of Rome" is said to teach that Confirmation is a sacrament, whereby grace given in Baptism is confirmed and made strong by the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost. The Roman Catholic teaching about the matter and form of the sacrament is stated,[1] and about the minister, "who must be a bishop, and none inferior minister"; and the same teaching about the effects of Confirmation is summarized, viz.: sins are pardoned, the grace of Baptism is made perfect, the Holy Ghost is given to the full, etc., propositions which Rogers held to contain "dangerous and very damnable doctrine."[2] For "it is an error" that Confirmation is a sacrament because it was not instituted by God, and "to say that popish Confirmation is grounded upon God's Word is to speak foul untruths." For Scripture makes no mention of the matter (chrism) nor of the form ("I sign thee," etc.); "nor of the minister, that of necessity he must be a bishop that is to confirm; nor of the effects, that thereby sins are pardoned and released, and Baptism consummated and made perfect."[3]

---

[1] Collier (ed. 1840), vii. 392.

[2] See E. G. Selwyn, Introduction to *Irenicum of John Forbes* (1923), p. 13.

[3] Anthony à Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* ed. 1815, vol. ii, col. 162-6, quoted by Dr. J. J. S. Perowne in his Introduction to Rogers's *The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England* (Parker Soc.), p. vi.

[4] Rogers, *The Catholic Doctrine*, etc., lettered on back "*Rogers on the XXXIX Articles*" (Parker Soc.), p. 252.

Finally, six errors are mentioned, one being the error "to maintain that any bishop can give heavenly graces to any creature," another "to say that men cannot be perfect Christians without popish Confirmation," and another "that by Confirmation the Holy Ghost is given to the full."[4]

This teaching was exactly in tune with that of the anti-Roman controversialists of the earlier part of Elizabeth's reign, and was as clearly opposed to the Prayer Book service and to the teaching of Hooker. Its appeal is the Puritan appeal to Scripture, save only where it relies on the Calvinist account of "ancient Confirmation." That it was welcome to the Calvinists in the Church is shown by the various editions of the book in the seventeenth century, and later; in 1770, an "abridgment" was published, and it was valued by the early Evangelicals (who were Calvinists), Toplady, Bickersteth, and others, in their day.[5]

The practice of Confirmation during the period between

---

[1] Rogers, *op. cit.* p. 253.
[2] *Op. cit.* p. 254.
[3] *Op. cit.* p. 255.
[4] *Ibid.*
[5] *Dict. of Nat. Biog.* xvii. 142, s.v. *Rogers*, *Thomas*, art. by W. A. Shaw.

Hooker's work and the primacy of Archbishop Laud is illustrated in part by the Visitation Articles of the Bishops. Hooker's teaching, the Canons of 1603, and the discussions at Hampton Court in 1604, very evidently had an effect; consequently, Confirmation itself, and not merely the catechizing which was to be the preparation and not the substitute for it, appears rather more frequently in the inquiries. Bishop Cotton at Exeter, and John King, Archdeacon of Nottingham, in 1599, both inquire whether children between 7 and 20 are catechized,[1] and so do Bishops Bancroft at London in 1601,[2] Thornborough at Bristol in 1603,[3] Bridges at Oxford in 1604,[4] Chaderton at Lincoln in the same year,[5] and Bancroft, now Archbishop, at Canterbury in 1605.[6] In all seven sets of Articles there is, however, no reference by name to Confirmation. But in 1607, Bishop Babington, at Worcester, asks the usual question about catechizing in the three necessary forms, "as also in the Catechism last set forth," whereby, he adds, "the children of the parish may be prepared for Confirmation, according to the 60 Canon."[7] The Archdeacon of Norfolk (probably T. Jegon) in 1608 inquires about catechizing,[8] as does the author of the Visitation Articles for Canterbury, probably Archbishop Abbot, in 1611,[9] but Confirmation is not mentioned. Bishop John King, however, at his Primary Visitation at London in 1612, inquires about catechizing "whereby the children of the parish may be prepared for Confirmation, and those which are confirmed for receiving of the Communion."[10] The same question is asked by H. Robinson, Archdeacon of Gloucester, who used this set of questions for his Visitation in 1629, only the Archdeacon omits the sentence "and those which are confirmed," replacing it by the words "according to the 90 Canon"[11] (90 being evidently a misprint for 60).

---

[1] Kennedy, *op. cit.* iii. 327, Art. 10, and Appendix E, p. 435, Arts. 12 and 14.

[2] App. E, p. 437, Art. 13 (misprinted 14).

[3] *Ibid.* p. 440, Art. 13.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 445, Arts. 14 and 16.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 448, Arts. 20 and 21.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 451, Art. 33.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 454, Art. 18.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 458, Art. 15.

[9] *Ibid.* pp. 459, 460, Arts. 26 and 127.

[10] *Ibid.* pp. 463, 464, Art. 19.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 464.

Dr. Sharpe, Archdeacon of Berkshire, in 1615 inquires about catechizing in the three forms and the Catechism, referring to Canon 59.[1] Archbishop Abbot, at Canterbury in 1616, asks about instructing " the youth and ignorant persons " in the three forms " and the sacrament " as prescribed in the Catechism.[2] Bishop Andrewes, at Winchester in 1619, inquires about instructing the youth,[3] and whether the children, etc., are duly sent to be catechized,[4] but Confirmation is not mentioned.[5]

But Bishop Howson, at Oxford in the same year, 1619, not only inquires carefully about catechizing in the form used by Bishop King at London in 1612 (which asserts the value of such instruction in preparation for Confirmation and Holy Communion), but adds : " And this we require you to have an especial care of ; as also to bring your children to be confirmed when the bishop shall come about that holy service." [6]

Bishop Overall, at Norwich in 1619, asks about catechizing,[7] but does not name Confirmation, and his Articles were reissued, in that respect without change, by his successors, Harsnet in 1627 and White in 1629. But Bishop Harsnet, visiting in the year after Overall, 1620, inquired, " Whether hath any person not lawfully confirmed according to the form of Confirmation, prescribed in the book of Common Prayer of this realm, been admitted to receive the Holy Communion." [8] The inquiry comes between two questions which concern " popish recusants or wilful sectaries," and was directed, presumbly, at the latter. The absence of such an inquiry from this same bishop's Visitation Articles in 1627 may be taken, perhaps, to show that the question produced satisfactory answers, *i.e.* that no unconfirmed persons had been admitted to Communion, so that its repetition was unnecessary. He inquires, of course, about catechizing.

---

[1] App. E, p. 469, Art. 22.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 471, Art. 10.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 475, Art. 17.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 476, Art. 9, " Touching Parishioners."

[5] Bishop Andrewes' Articles of 1619 were reissued in 1619, 1621, 1625, 1635, and 1638, by the Archdeacon of Surrey and by Bishop Curle of Winchester in 1636, with slight variations. There were no variations, however, in the matter of Confirmation. *Ibid.* p. 474.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 477, 478, Art. 15.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 482, Tit. ii, Art. 11.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 485, Tit. i, Art. 12.

Laud, at St. David's in 1622, inquired about catechizing in the three forms "and the Sacrament," repeating Archbishop Abbot's phrase of 1616.[1] Kent, Archdeacon of Sudbury in 1624, also inquired carefully about catechizing,[2] but neither mentioned Confirmation.

So in the Visitation inquiries of Bishops Andrewes at Winchester, 1625,[3] Williams at Lincoln in the same year, 1625, and again in 1627,[4] Davenant at Salisbury,[5] Neile at Winchester,[6] both in 1628, Potter at Carlisle,[7] and Eland, Archdeacon of Bedford,[8] both in 1629, there are the questions about catechizing, but no mention of Confirmation.

Bishop Curle, at Bath and Wells in 1630, asks carefully about catechizing,[9] but the Archdeacon of Norfolk (White) in the same year is singular in making no inquiry about it[10]; Williams, at Lincoln in 1630, asking about catechizing, inquires also about the Catechism used and "whether doth he admit any to the Communion that cannot say the Catechism appointed by the Book of Common Prayer."[11]

Davenant, Archdeacon of Berkshire,[12] and Kent, Archdeacon of Sudbury,[13] Bancroft, Bishop of Oxford,[14] and Robert White, Archdeacon of Norfolk[15] in 1632, and Bishop Curle at Winchester in 1633,[16] all inquire about catechizing, but do not mention Confirmation.

Archdeacon Davenant's omission to do this is the more significant because his Articles nearly all follow the Canons of 1603; thus his Article 22 is based on Canon 58, 23 on Canon 59, 24 on Canon 62. Canons 60 and 61, which deal with Confirmation, do not appear in the series, and the omission appears to be designed. The Archdeacon's Bishop, Dr. John Davenant, who was also his uncle, was a moderate Calvinist, whose opinions in this year (1631) got him into trouble at Court, though for the rest of his episcopate (he died in 1641) he acted as a loyal supporter of Laud's reforms. But, under the circumstances, this marked omission of any inquiry into the observance of the Canons on Confirmation seems to show an unwillingness in Calvinistic circles to insist upon the Church's rules in that regard. The appointment of Archbishop Laud to the See of Canterbury in 1633, to judge from the Visitation Articles, made a marked difference, for from that year onwards until the troubles began, every bishop whose Articles I have read inquires carefully about Confirmation, though, as will be seen, the archdeacons do not. Possibly Confirmation was held to be a matter outside their jurisdiction. Before examining that evidence there are other facts which illustrate the place of Confirmation in the life of the English Church between 1597 and 1633.

---

[1] App. E, p. 489, Tit. i, Art. 12.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 492, Art. 2.

[3] *Ibid.*, "Touching Ministers," etc., p. 494, Art. 5.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 497, Art. 9.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 501, Tit. 3, Art. 10.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 504, 505, Art. 22 and "Touching Parishioners," Art. 11.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 507, Art. 33.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 510, Art. 19. This series of Articles was also issued by Archbishop Neile at York in 1633.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 513, Art. 20.

[10] See his Articles. *Ibid.* pp. 516, 517.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 518, Tit. 2, Art. 11.

[12] *Ibid.* p. 523, Art. 23.

[13] *Ibid.* p. 526, Art. 25.

[14] *Ibid.* p. 529, Art. 7.

[15] *Ibid.* p. 531, Art. 19.

[16] *Ibid.* p. 534, Arts. 6 and 20.

Nicholas Ferrar was born in London on February 22, 1592-3. "About the year 1598 the Bishop of London (Richard Bancroft) held at St. Magnus's Church a Confirmation, whither Richard Francis, his schoolmaster, brought the said Nicholas Ferrar to be confirmed, as he was the second time by his own contrivance, and being asked by his master, 'Why did you so?' replied cheerfully, 'I did it because it was a good thing to have the bishop's prayers and blessing twice, and I have got it.'"[1]

From this it is evident that Bishop Bancroft had no objection to confirming very young children. Very different was the case of Dr. Peter Heylyn, later Prebendary of Westminster, the devoted follower of Archbishop Laud. Heylyn was born at Burford, Oxon, on November 29, 1600, and in December 1613 went up to Hart Hall, Oxford, being just over thirteen. He took his B.A. degree in 1617, was elected Fellow of Magdalen College in 1618, and became M.A. in 1620. But he was not confirmed until on "September the 15th, 1622, he received Confirmation from the hands of Bishop Lake (Dr. Arthur Lake, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1616-1626) in the Parish Church of Wells, and in a short time after exhibited a certificate to Dr. Langton (then President of Magdalen) concerning his age; by which means he obtained a Dispensation . . . that he should not be compelled to enter into Holy Orders till he was 24 year of age."[1]

---

[1] *Life of N. Ferrar*, by his brother, ed. Mayor (1855), p. 4.

No explanation of this long delay of Heylyn's Confirmation is given, and it is the more extraordinary because the See of Oxford was from 1604 onwards filled by excellent bishops. Possibly the long vacancies of the See (1568-1589, and again 1592-1604) had made clergy and people alike careless in the matter and had broken the old tradition.

Elsewhere in England that tradition certainly survived in districts so remote from one another as Yorkshire and Devon and Cornwall.

Dr. Tobias Matthew was Archbishop of York from 1606 till 1628. In his Diary the Archbishop recorded various notes of his administration of Confirmation between 1607 and 1619.[2] In 1607 he records:

> "Ripon. A visitation there, 17 Aug., when Dr. Favour the Sub-Dean preached, not I, ubi mille credo confirmavi, [where I confirmed, I believe, a thousand persons].
>
> "Aug. 21. Malton ubi non pauciores credo confirmavi post concionem meam, sic ut pene contabiscerem pro calore adeoque lectum conscendere meritus [where I confirmed, I believe, no fewer after my sermon, so that I nearly melted away with the heat and did indeed earn the right to go to bed].
>
> "Aug. 25. Visit. Beverley. Aug. 26. Visit. Hull, quibus in duobus oppidis duo ad minimum millia confirmabam impositione manuum [in which two towns I confirmed by laying on hands at the least 2,000 persons]."

The Archbishop records no more Confirmations in that year.

---

[1] *Life of Dr. Heylyn* (Anon. but said by Bishop Creighton to be by George Vernon, Rector of Bourton-on-the-Water; see *D.N.B. s.v.* Heylyn, Peter), prefixed to Heylyn's *Historical and Miscellaneous Tracts*, fol. 1681, p. iv.

[2] I quote from a transcript of the Diary made by the late Dr. R. W. Dixon, kindly lent to me by the Rev. A. Raine, Vicar of Dringhouses, York.

In 1608 he notes :

"Do. 3 (3rd Sunday) after Trinity, Southwell, ubi multos confirmavi [where I confirmed many] for the Bishop of Elie. I preached there.

"Do. 7 (7 S. after Trinity), Nottingham, ubi plurimos confirmavi [where I confirmed very many].

"Fest. Jacobi (25 July), Southwell, ubi multos confirmavi [where I confirmed many].

"Do. 12 (12 S. after Trinity), Pomfret, ubi magnam multitudinum omnis status confirmavi [where I confirmed a great multitude of every class].

"Do. 13 (13 S. after Trinity), Howden, quo die ibi quam plurimos confirmavi post meridiem eiusdem Sab. at Hemingborough, ideo non sum concionatus at Hemingborough [on which day I confirmed as many as possible there after midday of the same Sabbath at Hemingburgh, so I did not preach at Hemingburgh].

"Do. 14, Sherburn, ubi plures confirmavi [where I confirmed more).

"Septr. 9. Wakefield
Do. 16. Hallyfax
Septr. 12. Bradford
Septr. 13. Leedes
} ubi confirmavi aliquot millia [where I confirmed several thousands].

"Do. 18, [the Archbishop notes,] Manus imposui 8 sacerdotibus et 6 diaconis at Cawood Church; ideo non sum concionatus[1] [I laid hands on 8 priests and six deacons, . . . so I did not preach]." The use of *sacerdos* in this connexion instead of the usual *presbyter* is notable, and is evidence, presumably, of the "intention" of the ordainer. A little later he dates an entry "Fest. Omn. Animarum. Rippon," *i.e.* Feast of All Souls.

In the Spring of 1609 he is at Cawood, and records :

"Do. 2, post Pasch. [2 S. after Easter], Selby ubi confirmavi ad minimum quingentos [where I confirmed at least 500].

"Fest. Ascension [Ascension Day], Barwick in Elmet ubi plur. confirm., et in Averford similiter [where I confirmed very many, and at Aberford likewise].

---

[1] The passage occurs on fol. 6 of the transcript.

"Do. 6 [evidently Sunday after Ascension Day], Braiton ubi permultos confirmavi [where I confirmed a great many]."

In 1610 he records only a confirmation at Wetherby on the 13th S. after Trinity, "ubi permultos confirmavi" [where I confirmed a great many].

In 1611 he notes Visitations at Beverley and Hull on April 8 and 9, but records no facts about confirmations. At the end of the year he notes that he had preached 55 sermons and writes "Laus Deo."

In 1612 he records on Feb. 20 "an intolerable paine by a corne on the upper joint of my middle toe of my left foot," but notes no confirmations, nor does he in 1613, when he records only various illnesses.

In 1614 he notes "Do. 18 [18 S. after Trinity], Stillingfleet, where I confirmed many, both young and old, in my way to Bishopthorpe perendie [two days later]."

In 1615 he is on Visitation on May 16 at York and proceeds to Scarborough and elsewhere in the North Riding, but no facts about Confirmation appear.

In 1616 "Do. 18, Festum S^{ti} Michs [18 S. after Trinity, Feast of S. Michael], Bolton Percy, ubi plurimos confirmavi [where I confirmed very many]."

In 1617 and 1618 he records no confirmations, but under the 4 S. in Advent of the latter he writes "Reuma, Reuma, Reuma" (Rheumatism).

In 1619, on April 20, the Archbishop visits at York Minster and proceeds on the same errand to Beverley. On "Do. 4 p. Pascham [4 S. after Easter]" he writes: "Hull, ubi confirmavi circiter mille [where I confirmed about 1,000]."

On May 5 he is on Visitation at Otley and notes: "Fest. Ascensionis [Ascension Day], Ibid prædicavi et confirmavi mille vel plures unde fessus defessus [At the same place I preached and confirmed a thousand or more, whence I was tired out.]"

Yet on "Do. 1 p. Trinit. [1 S. after Trinity]" he was at

"Rippon," ubi visitabam proximo die et plurimos confirmabam [where I visited the next day, and confirmed a great many.]"

No more confirmations are noted; in 1621 he records but eighteen sermons preached, adding "Eheu, eheu." He died at the age of eighty-two on March 29, 1628.

It is noticeable that Archbishop Matthew did not confine his confirmations to the stated occasions when he was on Visitation, and that, out of the twenty-five confirmations which he records, ten were in villages, many of them within an easy ride of his castle at Cawood, viz. Sherburn, Barwick-in-Elmet, Aberford, Brayton, Stillingfleet, Howden, Hemingburgh, while Wetherby and Bolton Percy were not far off. But it was not only in the diocese of York that candidates by the thousand flocked to be confirmed in the first part of the seventeenth century; the same is true of Devon and Cornwall.

In 1627 Dr. Joseph Hall (1574-1656), the well-known writer, was consecrated Bishop of Exeter. In 1641 he was translated to Norwich, and in 1649 he published the first treatise in English on the subject of Confirmation, called Χειροθεσία, *or the Apostolique Institution of Imposition of Hands for Confirmation.*[1] The Bishop is specially concerned to meet the statements made by Cardinal Bellarmine in his *De Sacramento Confirmationis* and the decrees of the Council of Trent, but the first part of his little book is most valuable for the picture of the devotion, or, as he calls it, "the over-eager and tumultuous affection," with which Confirmation was sought in the Western shires. "It cannot be spoken with what fervour and violence of desire that people were wont to sue for this sacred ceremony. What Fair-like confluences have we there seen of zealous ambients! How have we been tired with the importunity of suitors, impatient of either denial or delay! How have we been oppressed with the throngs of the multitude, striving for the first admission! In so much, as we have been forced to call for the help of officers to our rescue from that well-meant impetuousness."

---

[1] The copy I have used is in the edition of the Bishop's *Works* in 12 vols. (Oxford, 1837). It is printed in vol. x. 440-465. As a monograph, "By a Lover of Truth and Peace," it was published in London, 1649, according to W. Jackson's *History of Confirmation*, 1877, p. 34, note *s*.

The Bishop goes on to ascribe the Western Rising of 1549 to the popular zeal for Confirmation, of which they had been deprived "by reason of the absence or willing forbearance of Miles Coverdale, their elected Bishop." "Willing forbearance" is, under the circumstances, a strange phrase, and the good bishop shows himself at this point very ignorant of the story. For in 1549 Coverdale was not a bishop, he did indeed act as coadjutor in some respects to the aged Bishop of Exeter in 1550, but he was not consecrated to the See until August 30, 1551, and was deprived in September 1553. So that his opportunities of "willing forbearance" in the matter of confirming his people were but few, and only began two years after 1549. It is more interesting to note that Bishop Hall attributes this eager desire for Confirmation which existed in the West to "an unfounded, overweening opinion" derived from their ancestors, and he thought it an error which might, in due time, be redressed. Doubtless, his successors at Exeter and Truro in the last fifty years have found that redress has been duly accomplished.

Another fragment of evidence for the manner, and not the most edifying manner, of administering Confirmation at this period is recorded by Aubrey in his account of the poet and wit Dr. Richard Corbet, Dean of Christ Church and friend of Ben Jonson, who was Bishop of Oxford 1628-1632, and of Norwich 1632-1635. "One time, as he was confirming, the country people pressing in to see the ceremony, said he, 'Bear off there, or I'll confirm ye with my staff.' There was a man with a great, venerable beard; said the bishop, 'You, behind the beard.' Another time, being to lay his hand on the head of a man very bald, he turns to his chaplain and said, 'Some dust, Lushington,' to keep his hand from slipping."[1]

From these fragments it is clear that in the dioceses of York and Exeter, as well as in that of Oxford, there was at this period, notwithstanding previous episcopal neglect, a deeply rooted belief in Confirmation, while the candidates were evidently by no means all children, as the witness of Archbishop Matthew and the stories of Bishop Corbet show, though the last bishop's ill-timed jocularity cannot have helped to maintain belief in the sacredness and solemnity of the rite.

---

[1] Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, ed. A. Clark (1898), i. 186, *s.v.* Richard Corbet.

Richard Baxter gives a vivid picture of Confirmation as he knew it. "When I was a schoolboy, about fifteen years of age, the bishop coming into the country, many went of him to be confirmed: we that were boys ran out to see the bishop among the rest, not knowing anything of the meaning of the business: when we came thither, we met about thirty or forty in all, of our own stature and temper, that had come for to be *bishopped*, as then it was called: the bishop examined us not at all in one article of the faith; but in a church-yard, in haste we were set in a rank, and he passed hastily over us, laying his hands on our head, and saying a few words, which neither I nor any that I spoke with, understood; so hastily were they uttered, and a very short prayer recited, and there was an end. But whether we were Christians or infidels, or knew so much as that there was a God, the bishop little knew, nor inquired. And yet he was esteemed one of the best bishops in England. And though the canons require that the curate or minister send a certificate that children have learned the catechism, yet there was no such thing done, but we ran of our own accord to see the bishop only; and almost all the rest of the country had not this much: this was the old, careless practice of this excellent duty of confirmation."[1]

The date referred to is about 1630; Baxter was born in 1615, and the bishop mentioned is Dr. Thomas Morton (1564-1659), who was Bishop of Lichfield from 1618 to 1632. He was a divine of great learning and severe life; theologically "he would now be reckoned a low churchman."[2] Baxter's account was published in 1658. Baxter seems to have given a briefer account in another of his books.[3] The confirmation, it will be noticed, took place in the churchyard and the account explains Cosin's dislike of these open-air confirmations.[4]

---

[1] *Works*, ed. Orme, xiv. p. 481, 2.

[2] *Dict. of Nat. Biog.* xiii. 1061.

[3] *Third Defence of Nonconformists*, p. 40.

[4] See below, p. 130.

PERIOD 4, 1633-1660. FROM THE PRIMACY OF ARCHBISHOP LAUD TO THE RESTORATION

In August 1633 William Laud, Bishop of London, was nominated and elected Archbishop of Canterbury, and the election was confirmed in the next month; and from 1633 the Visitation Articles of the Bishops exhibit a greater care in inquiries about Confirmation.

Lindsell, at his primary Visitation at Peterborough in 1633, asks about catechizing and whether the afternoon sermons are turned into catechizing by question and answer, as the royal directions had ordered,[1] and whether any are admitted to Communion "before they can say their catechism or be confirmed."[2] Goodman, at Gloucester in 1634 (and again in 1640), inquires about catechizing, "according to the 59th Canon,"[3] and in the articles concerning parishioners inquires first of all "whether hath any parishioner been admitted to receive the Holy Communion, or to be a Godfather or Godmother, or whether have any been married who have not been first confirmed by the Bishop?"[4] Archbishop Laud himself, in his Metropolitical Visitation of Norwich in 1635, asks whether the afternoon sermons are "turned into catechizing by question and answer,"[5] and whether the youth are instructed each Sunday before Evening Prayer, and whether the curate is "careful to tender all such youth of his Parish as have been well instructed in their Catechism, to be confirmed by the Bishop in his Visitation, or any other convenient time as is appointed by the book" of Common Prayer.[6] Bishop Williams, no Laudian assuredly, at Lincoln in 1635, asks exactly the same question ("is he careful to tender," etc.), and he adds to it the words, "And you are to warn the ministers to prepare them against this present Visitation."[7] Wren, at Norwich in 1636, is equally clear, indeed clearer. He asks whether the minister "doth at the Font, as soon as he hath baptized any child, admonish them to bring the child to the Bishop to be confirmed, as soon as he hath learned the Catechism ?" And then, having asked in the next Article strictly about catechizing, he inquires further, "Doth your Minister or Curate admit any to the Communion before they can say their Catechism and be confirmed ?"[1]

---

[1] Appendix E, p. 539, "Concerning Ministers," etc., Arts. 14 and 15.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 540, Art. 19.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 544, Art. 12.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 545.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 547, Art. 2.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 548, Art. 11.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 552, "Concerning the Clergy," Art. 11.

The archidiaconal Visitation Articles for this period refer, as has been said, only to catechizing, *e.g.* the Archdeacon of Berkshire (John Rives) in 1635,[2] Kingsley, Archdeacon of Canterbury, 1636,[3] Pearson, Archdeacon of Suffolk, 1636,[4] the Dean of the Peculiars of Canterbury, 1637,[5] Thornburgh, Archdeacon of Worcester, 1638,[6] Bostock, Archdeacon of Suffolk,[7] and Robert White, Archdeacon of Norfolk, in 1640.[8] Most of these inquiries are detailed and strict, but none of them ask whether the catechized youth are presented for Confirmation, nor whether any are communicated being unconfirmed. In view of the tone of the inquiries, the omission seems to be due to a view that Confirmation was not matter for inquiry for any but the Bishop.

For the episcopal inquiries of this period are precise: thus Brian Duppa, at Chichester 1638, has a chapter in his Articles headed "Of Confirmation and Catechism preparatory to it," under which he has three inquiries, one about teaching the Catechism, another about turning the afternoon sermons on Sunday into catechizing by question and answer, and a third whether the minister, when the children are sufficiently catechized, doth "admonish their parents to bring them to the Bishop to receive by prayer such confirmation as may strengthen them in Baptismal Grace received ?"[9] Richard Montagu, at Norwich, also in 1638, is particularly careful in his inquiries. He asks whether the minister catechizes for at least half an hour, and whether he admits as godparents young children under age, who cannot render an account of their faith, or never were confirmed.[1] He inquires, further, whether, according to the charge given at Baptism and according to the appointment of the Prayer Book, the minister "doth transmit" the child by him catechized "to the Bishop to receive further Confirmation of the graces of God's Spirit upon him?" and in the next question he continues: "That this religious and ancient course may the better be observed, and facilitated the more, doth the Minister . . . catechize?"[2] This chapter of the book of Articles (Tit. 6) is headed, "Of the Sacrament of Baptism; and Sacramentals remembered in the Service-book," and there follows the quotation, "Accedat Verbum ad Elementum et fiet Sacramentum."[3] Finally, under "Concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper," the bishop enjoins, "He is not to admit boys and girls thereto, under sixteen years of age, nor any young person who hath not rendered an account of his faith, and is not confirmed by the Bishop. Is this observed or not?"[4]

---

[1] Appendix E, p. 560, chap. 4, Arts. 14, 15, and 20.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 523, Art. 23.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 567, Art. 32.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 570, Tit. 5, Art. 11.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 573, Art. 17.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 586, Arts. 35 and 36.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 597, chap. 5, Art. 7.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 600, chap. 2, Art 8.

[9] Second Report, etc., App. E, p. 577.

The series for this period ends with the Articles of one of the most important of the bishops, who was to succeed Laud in the Primacy when the troubles were over, as he had already succeeded him as President of St. John's College, Oxford, and as Bishop of London, William Juxon, who was also Lord High Treasurer of England. In 1640 Juxon visited his diocese and his Articles were regarded as so exactly representing the standard of the Church of England that by Canon 9 of the Canons passed by Convocation in that year ("One Book of Articles of Enquiry to be used at all Parochial Visitations"), these questions, allowing each bishop to add to them in certain cases, were adopted as the official Visitation Articles.[5] They have, therefore, an unusual importance.

Under the title "Concerning the Celebration of Divine Service," etc., he inquires, "Doth your Minister, having

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 582, Tit. 5, Art. 21, and Tit. 6, Art. 6.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 583, Tit. 6, Arts. 8 and 9.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 582, Tit. 7, Art. 5.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 583.

[5] Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus* (1668), p. 441. Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* (1841), viii. 184.

Cure and charge of Souls, do his best endeavour to prepare children and make them ready for Confirmation? And to that end doth he on every Sunday and Holy Day before Evening Prayer for the space of half an hour or more" instruct the youth, etc., in the Catechism? And are the afternoon sermons turned into Catechizing?[1]

The next question asks, "Doth your Minister either bring or send in writing to the Bishop of the diocese the names of all those Children of his parish which can answer to the questions contained in the Catechism, that by the imposition of hands and prayer, they may receive strength and defence against temptation? And doth he admit any person or persons to the Holy Communion, until such time as he or they can orderly say the Catechism and be confirmed?"[2]

The authority for these articles is set against each of them in the margin. For Art. 20 the reference is to Canons 60 and 61 and the Rubric of Confirmation; for Art. 21, Instructions, Rubric of Confirmation.

Thus the official teaching of the Church in the Prayer Book and its support in the Canons, often in the past neglected or slurred over in deference to Calvinistic pressure, was solemnly and unanimously affirmed by the Bishops in 1640.

In addition to the Visitation Articles some light is shed from other sources on the administration of Confirmation during the period.

There is some slight evidence for the continuance of the practice of repeating the Christian name at Confirmation. In 1628 Sir Edward Coke (1552-1634) published his commentary upon Littleton's *Treatise on Tenures*, and in it took occasion to say that "If a man be baptized by the name of Thomas, and after, at his confirmation by the bishop, he is named John, his name of confirmation shall stand good. And this was the case of Sir Francis Gawdie,[3] whose name of baptism was Thomas, and his name of confirmation Francis, and that name of Francis, by the advice of all the judges, in anno. 36 Hen. VIII, he did bear and after used in all his purchases and grants."[1] Coke's comment, at the least, suggests that the practice of naming at Confirmation existed (though it had not been mentioned in the rubric since 1552) and he held that a Common Law right existed. Mr. Maskell gives an instance, on the authority of Bishop White Kennet (1660-1728), of such a change of name in Queen Anne's reign.

---

[1] App. E, p. 590, Art. 20.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 591, Art. 21.

[3] His name is commonly spelt Gawdy. He died in 1606.

"On Sunday Dec. 21, 1707, the Ld. Bishop of Lincoln [William Wake] confirmed a young lad in Hen. VII Chapel: who upon that ceremony was to change his Xtian name: and accordingly the sponsor who presented him, delivered to the Bp. a certificate wh. his Ldship signed, to notify that he had confirmed such a person by such a name, and did order the Parish Minister then present to register the Person in the Parish Book under that Name. This was done by the opinion under hand of Sir Edward Northey, and the like opinion of Ld. Ch. Justice Holt, founded on the authority of Sir Edwd. Coke," etc.[2]

The use of the sign of the cross in Confirmation, referred to in a sermon in 1619, quoted above,[3] is again referred to in Bishop Montagu's *De Originibus Ecclesiasticis* of 1636.[4] The bishop writes: "In our days among our own selves it is a frequent practice to make the sign of the cross in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ; both publicly in Baptism as we are commanded to do, and in the Confirmation of those who have been catechized, and in all the other Sacraments of the Church; and also in our ordinary life and conversation."

The infrequency of Confirmation, which had been a scandal in Elizabethan days, was in process of being done away, if it had not, indeed, entirely ceased. Of John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln 1621-1642, Archbishop of York 1642 till his death in 1650, it is recorded by his admiring biographer, Bishop Hacket of Lichfield, that "he seldom travelled but notice being given before, he stayed at some town or village to confirm such as were but even past children, to lay his hands on them, and to bless them, and did it oftener than the 60 canon requires: an ancient and admirable order, when such were presented as were before made ready by being exactly catechized."[1]

---

[1] The passage is quoted from *Coke upon Littleton*, Instit. I. 3*a*, in Maskell, *Monumenta Rit.* (1846); I. ccxvi., ccxvii, in part and imperfectly in *D.N.B.* *s.v.* Gawdy, Sir Francis.

[2] Maskell, *op. cit.* i. ccxviii.

[3] Above, pp. 80, 87.

[4] Tome 1, pt. 2, p. 79, quoted by Pullan, *History of the Book of C.P.* p. 209.

These peripatetic confirmations were not always edifying, as appears from the note made by Cosin, then Master of Peterhouse and Archdeacon of the East Riding, about 1640, when a revision of the Prayer Book was contemplated[2]; the note is a suggested correction in the Order for Confirmation. Cosin writes: "The place whereunto the children shall be brought for their confirmation is left to the appointment of the bishop. If the place were ordered here to be none but the church, and there the office to be done with the Morning or Evening Prayer annexed, it would avoid the offensive liberty that herein hath been commonly taken, to confirm children in the streets, in the highways, and in the common fields, without any sacred solemnity."[3]

The little light thrown on the administration of Confirmation at this period comes almost entirely from the life either of the bishop or of the candidate; there seems to be no direct evidence from any parish priest. George Herbert was Rector of Bemerton, and a priest less than three years (1630-1632/3), else his *Priest to the Temple, or the Country Parson*, would surely have contained a reference to the preparation and presentation of candidates for Confirmation. It does indeed contain a delightful chapter on "The Parson catechizing" (ch. xxi) and in the chapter which follows, "The Parson in Sacraments," there is a strong argument for admitting young communicants to Holy Communion: "Children and youths are usually deferred too long, under pretence of devotion to the Sacrament," etc., while in ch. xix the parson is said to observe "Visitations, and being there, makes due use of them, as of Clergy councils, for the benefit of the diocese"; but there is no reference to Confirmation.

---

[1] Hacket, *Life of Williams*, ii. 61, quoted in Mayor's *Nicholas Ferrar* (Cambridge, 1855), p. 4, note 2.

[2] For the date see Cosin, *Works*, v. p. xx. and p. 502 note (a).

[3] *Ibid.* p. 523.

The Visitations were doubtless those of the archdeacon, so that Herbert's silence on the subject is probably due to the fact that in his less than three years as a parish priest he had no pastoral experience of Confirmation.

Cosin appears to have compiled his various series of "Notes upon the Book of Common Prayer" at three periods between 1619 and 1660. The First Series appear to belong to the years 1619-1623, the Second Series to the years 1638-1660, while the Third Series seem to have been written about 1640.[1] If this ascription be correct, the First and Third Series of Notes are evidence for the history of Confirmation from 1619 to 1640.

In the First Series Cosin notes that "the Novatians were the old puritans of the primitive Church and make no more account of Confirmation than our new ones do."[2] He holds that it is a "Holy Sacrament (for so we need not fear to call it in a right sense),"[3] and after various patristic references, concludes: "so that there is more in it than Calvin would have, who tells us that it is nothing else but a certain public profession of faith made before the bishop," etc.[4]

Cosin is here quoting Calvin from Maldonatus, *de Sacramentis*, as his learned editor points out; but, as he shows by a reference to the passage already quoted from the *Institutes* (lib. iv, cap. xix, 4), the view is Calvin's, and Dr. Barrow points out very gently that Calvin supposed that the bishop examined the baptized "according to a catechism which he imagined existed."[5] Cosin proceeds to note that Infant Confirmation, like Infant Communion, "is now taken away by the consent of the whole Western Church," and he shows that the rubric which asserts that Confirmation is given as "a strength and defence against all temptations to sin" contains all that Maldonatus requires. He quotes him "*ut acciperent robur Spiritus Sancti ad perfungenda omnia munera hominis Christiani,*" and adds, "This is here said in words as full as his." He concludes that the controversy the Roman Church makes "is not to be made with our Church, but with them of the new stamp of Geneva." He quotes "Eusebius Emissenus," and concludes the point succinctly, "The proper effect of Baptism is to make a man a Christian, but the proper effect of Confirmation is to give him the Holy Ghost."[1]

---

[1] See the very learned and thorough Preface to Cosin's *Works*, vol. v (Anglo-Catholic Library), by Dr. John Barrow, then Principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, particularly pp. xviii, xix.

[2] *Works*, v. 140. [3] *Ibid.* p. 142. [4] *Ibid.* p. 143.

[5] Cosin, *Works*, v. 143, note (q).

Cosin discusses, at some length, the necessity of Confirmation, and holds that, important as it is, yet "the Church of God in all ages never held it so absolutely necessary, as if without it salvation might not be obtained. The Papists are accused to hold this opinion, but, for my part, I suppose they have some wrong done unto them," and he explains the *Decretum* of Gratian, which was alleged against Roman Catholics.[2] He holds that, though not absolutely necessary, yet without the help of Confirmation a man "may hap to perish as he goes." After Baptism "there are many things needful, and among the rest this a chief one, to be confirmed, and to receive a more perfect power of the Holy Ghost for the resisting of the temptations of Satan." He comments on Acts viii, and points out that, though the Apostles had received the Holy Ghost when baptized and ordained by Christ, "yet we read that, after both these, the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because they were not then endued with that fulness of ghostly strength, which they had poured upon them at the feast of Pentecost. Before, they were all fearful, that they fled and ran away. After, they were so full of courage that no death and martyrdom could amaze them."[3]

Discussing the ceremonies used "in the Confirmation of this Sacrament" (an odd phrase, unless for "Confirmation" he meant "Conferring"), Cosin notes "two very ancient, chrism, and the cross; the other two more late, gossips and the blow upon the cheek. Three of these we omit, as not being necessary; yet being so significant, it were better we had them; neither were it any fault, for aught I can see, if any man should use them in our Church, more than it is to use the fourth, of having godfathers and godmothers at the time of Confirmation."[4] By the rubrics of the Prayer Book then in use, a child had a godfather and godmother at Confirmation, but the passage certainly reads as if Cosin had neither seen nor heard of the use of the sign of the cross used at Confirmation. The Bishop of Norwich in his youth and early manhood was Dr. Jegon, who had been on the Calvinist side at Cambridge and would have been most unlikely to use such a ceremony, and evidently Overall, Cosin's patron and hero, who succeeded Jegon, did not use it either, or Cosin would have known it.

---

[1] Cosin, *Works*, v. pp. 144, 145.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 146.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 147.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 149.

In his Third Series of Notes, which belong, as is supposed, to 1640, Cosin discusses some of the same points afresh. "Confirmation (though it be very behoveful) is not absolutely necessary to salvation, being not of Christ's own institution, as the Sacrament of Baptism is."[1] He quotes authorities to show that "it was instituted only by the Church, in imitation of the Apostles." Further, he thinks that of old some were received "to the Communion, and to sacred orders also, who had never been confirmed," and he quotes the case of Novatian, A.D. 240; but the case, as his editor points out, is not absolutely clear.[2]

He states that "when the children of Christians had learned Christ's religion, they were brought to the church, and presented to the bishop, and professed openly their faith, and said they would live and die in it. . . . This was the ratifying of their profession, made by others in their name at their baptism; and for that cause it was called Confirmation."[3] No reference is given for this statement, and it looks as though Cosin was here transcribing the passage from Calvin or Bucer, for almost all the notes on Confirmation in this series are from Bucer's *Censura*.

Commenting on the rubric that "the bishop shall give knowledge for children to be brought," etc., he notes that Bucer says this would be most conveniently done in their Visitations, and adds, "and to that commonly did the bishops ever since hold themselves, which was much too seldom."[4]

He notes also, and thus gives a glimpse of contemporary

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 484.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 486, note (i).

[3] *Ibid.* p. 487.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 488.

English practice, "Many can say their Catechism and are confirmed at seven years old; shall it be then in the power of the Curate to admit them also to the Communion? *Non credo*; but this shows that they should not be confirmed so young as they used to be, but when they are of perfect age, and ready to be admitted to the Holy Communion, which is between fourteen and sixteen years of age."[1]

Further, in his note on the words of Confirmation and comparing them with the form used in 1549, Cosin says: "This seems to be rather a prayer that may be said by any minister, than a confirmation that was reserved only to the bishop,"[2] and he concludes with a short discussion of the minister of the sacrament, noting a Gallican canon of 441 which permitted a priest, in the absence of a bishop, to confirm heretics in danger of death who desired to become Catholics.[3]

In the Second Series of Notes Cosin makes no remarks at all upon the Order of Confirmation, and his later fragment on Confirmation belongs to the next period.

Herbert Thorndike (1598-1672), Fellow of Trinity and Prebendary of Westminster, published his treatise of *The Government of the Church* in 1641, and his *Right of the Church in a Christian State* in 1649, in both of which he treats of Confirmation; but his opinions will be considered with those of the divines after the Restoration.

In 1642, soon after the troubles began, Jeremy Taylor, then Rector of Uppingham, joined the King at Oxford, and soon after, "by His Majesty's command," published his *Episcopacy asserted*, etc. Section viii of this book is concerned with Confirmation, and the subject is treated with clarity and learning. The teaching is identical with that of Taylor's great contribution to the subject, Χρῖσις Τελειωτική, published twenty years later, much less fully elaborated, so that no detailed account of it is needed here.[4]

Dr. Joseph Hall, Bishop first of Exeter and then of Norwich, who died in 1656, wrote, as has been said, the first monograph in English on Confirmation.[1] Hall had been one of the English divines present at the Synod of Dort in 1618, and was by no means of the school of Archbishop Laud; but his opinions on Confirmation were not those of the Calvinists. He printed his little book anonymously, in 1649, having been expelled from his see by the Puritans, for he says, "I durst not, therefore, but impart these thoughts to the world before I leave it."[2] The bishop grounds his defence of Confirmation as being apostolic on Heb. vi. 2 (§ 1), and considers that "this sacred rite" has been "foully wronged by a double extreme" of excess and of defect. Roman Catholics over-value it, holding it to be a sacrament, indeed a sacrament more worthy than Baptism (§§ 3, 4). This charge had become a commonplace of some Anglican controversialists, though, as Cosin showed above, it rested on a misunderstanding. After giving his experience of confirmations when he was Bishop of Exeter,[3] related above, Hall considers the error of defect, for he finds "an universal neglect" of "this holy duty in all the Churches that profess Reformation." The bishop holds that the view that the Apostles, by laying their hands on persons formerly baptized, thereby conveyed to them the Holy Ghost, is so clear a truth as none durst ever deny. Their successors justly claim the same privilege. He quotes evidence for the practice from the first three centuries, including Acts viii. 17 and xix. 6, and asks, "Have we any warrant for banishing it out of the Church of God? . . . Have we less need of grace of Confirmation than our forefathers . . . or are we less qualified to perform this gracious act than our predecessors?" He answers, "Surely the Church of England, which, to her eternal praise and honour be it spoken, hath ever since been careful to maintain all Apostolical Constitutions and Practices above all her Reformed Sisters, hath not failed to hold out this holy ordinance; and to recommend it, in the most ancient, simple, and inoffensive form to all her obedient children" (§ 8). The bishop then quotes Protestant writers of the preceding age who in their writings commended Confirmation: Melancthon, Flaccius Illyricus, Chemnitz, Hemigius, "that great light of Denmark," and "the just glory of the French Church, Mr. Calvin." These writers indeed, in the passages quoted by the bishop, insist on the value of the baptized making a formal profession of their faith, but they are all silent about any gift of the Holy Spirit in such a rite. Their "Confirmation" was something very different from the rite preserved in the Church of England.

---

[1] Cosin, *Works*, v. p. 488. [2] p. 489. [3] p. 490.

[4] For the section see Heber's edition of Bishop Taylor's *Works*, vii. 22-27.

---

[1] "Χειροθεσία, or the Apostolic Institution of Imposition of Hands, for Confirmation Revived," printed in Hall's *Works* (vol. 12, ed. 1837), x. 440, *seq.* It was published at London, 1649, under the authorship of "A Lover of Truth and Peace."

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 441.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 446.

Finally, the bishop appeals for the practice of Confirmation on three grounds:

(1) Primitive usage, about which, as he points out, both Roman Catholic and Reformed writers are agreed.

(2) The benefit which Confirmation brings to the Church of England through the due instruction of its younger members by catechizing.

(3) The mischiefs that follow its disuse: catechizing is neglected, parents are neglectful, and communicants are unprepared. This last mischief would be remedied if "the precedent [?] and godly order of our Church were duly observed: that none should be admitted to the Communion but those that have been confirmed."

He admits that Confirmation was, for a time, neglected, but he claims that the Canon of 1603 reformed the practice. "There wanted heads on which to lay hands," though in some places of the remoter dioceses this "Episcopal Benediction was in the other extreme;" it was sought with too much heat so that it was not possible "to be given otherwise than in a breathless and tumultuary way."

The teaching of this little treatise about the effect of Confirmation is quite clear: Bishop Hall holds that there is a gift of the Holy Spirit given in Confirmation, and that it is given in answer to the prayers of the bishop and congregation. He grounds the practice on Holy Scripture, Acts viii and xix and Heb. vi, as well as on the Fathers.

Hall's work refers to a state of things which was closed practically by the Puritan success in committing Archbishop Laud to the Tower on December 18, 1640, a success which culminated on January 4, 1642/3, when an Ordinance abolishing the Prayer Book was passed by what remained of the House of Lords. Henceforth until 1660 Confirmation was illegal, like all other Prayer Book offices, and if it was administered it could only have been had by stealth from such bishops, English and Irish, as remained at large. Yet, even during that period of proscription, a book was published which contains shortly but quite clearly the teaching of the Prayer Book and the Canons on the subject. This was a small duodecimo, *The Holy Feasts and Fasts of the Church*, by a devoted Royalist, Dr. William Brough, Canon of Windsor and Dean of Gloucester, and, as he declares proudly on his title-page, "One of His late Majesty's Chaplains-in-Ordinary." The book is a series of Meditations for the Fasts and Festivals, and the Meditation for "Whitson Tuesday" appropriately considers the methods by which the gifts of the Holy Spirit are given.[1] This leads the author to speak of "Laying on of Hands," which, he says, "must not be laid aside. For, as it is an Apostolick use, so it is by Ordinance. And no petty one and *superstructive* piece, but a Principall and *Fundamentall* in the Building. Not a Pinacle, but a Pillar in the Temple." He continues that "They of *Rome* raise it too high, and make it a *Sacrament* of the Church. And some Reformed sink it too low, taking it for a superfluity in it"; but "the Church of England . . . holds it not such a Sacrament as is generally necessary to Salvation: yet such an Ordinance as is Requisite after Baptism, and before the Holy Communion."[2]

The more famous Royalist divine and scholar, Dr. Henry Hammond, Archdeacon of Chichester and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, published, early in 1653/4, his treatise *Of Fundamentals*,[3] and in chapter xix, which deals with "The Necessaries to the Superstructing of Good Life on this Foundation," he treats of Confirmation, which he describes as "a most profitable usage of the Church transcribed from the practice of the Apostles." It has two parts, first "the child's undertaking in his own name every part of the baptismal vow,"[1] and second, "the prayer and benediction of the bishop, the successor of the Apostles in this office," given by imposition of hands which the Apostles used instead of "that divine insufflation which Christ had used to them in conferring the Holy Ghost upon them." The "matter of this benediction and petition" is the strength of Christ, the daily increase of the manifold gifts of grace (and here he names, one by one, the seven gifts, as in the Confirmation prayer), and he concludes that the prayer of the congregation may, by our Lord's promise to give the Holy Spirit, avail "to bring down that grace . . . on all that come duly qualified to receive it." As authority for his exposition, Hammond refers in the margin to Acts viii. 18. He adds "that this being designed by the Church to certify those that are thus confirmed of God's favour and goodness toward them," it has the advantage of engaging and obliging us "to a constant obedience to Him."[2] Thus Hammond is in line with Hooker and practically all the divines who immediately succeeded him in emphasizing the truth that in Confirmation a gift is given and received.

---

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 54.

[2] *Op. cit.* pp. 55, 56.

[3] Reprinted in Hammond's *Minor Theological Works*, edited by N. Pocock, 3rd ed. Anglo-Catholic Library, 1849. It was published in London in 1657.

Hammond further composed a treatise *de Confirmatione*, which was edited by Humphrey Henchman, Bishop of Salisbury, with an interesting Address to the Reader. It was published, in Latin, at Oxford in 1661, and it thus appeared after the author's death, which took place on April 25, 1660, in his 55th year, an event which Bishop Gilbert Burnet described as "an unspeakable loss to the Church." Hammond's *de Confirmatione* was reprinted in the folio edition of his works,[3] but it seems to have escaped much attention, a remarkable fate, considering the wealth of learning which the author has poured into his treatise. It was kept back from publication, Bishop Fell says in his Life of Hammond, "upon prudential or rather charitative reasons,"[4] but it is strange that it has not been reprinted since 1674 nor translated into English. For it is one of the most complete and learned accounts of Confirmation written by any English divine. Its form is against it; it is a reply, point by point, to a foreign Protestant, Johannes Dallæus ("Mr. Dailee," Bishop Fell calls him). Hammond deals first with his opponent's objection that, in the earliest ages, Confirmation was merely one of the ceremonies of Baptism.[1] He proceeds to explain the Anglican view: "Inter ritus *Apostolicos*, aut Ecclesiasticos, licet non inter Sacramenta a Christo instituta, *Confirmationem Episcopalem* numerare consuevimus."[2] But he holds that, in the broader sense of the term, Confirmation is fittingly called a sacrament: St. Cyprian called it so; so did the Council of Carthage. However we restrict the term "sacrament" to rites instituted by our Lord and universally necessary to salvation.[3] He quotes (he is the first writer to do so) the *Necessary Erudition* of 1543, a work issued "before what we call the Reformation of doctrines," and then discusses, with great learning, the patristic authorities for chrism in Baptism and Confirmation. He concludes that we do not regard as superstitious those who use chrism: "Hos et alios innumeros ritus inter adiaphora numeramus, quæ ut laudabiliter adhiberi, ita et libere omitti posse nulli dubitamus."[4] But imposition of hands is apostolical, as Acts viii. 17 shows. By all means, he says, let Latins and Greeks sign and anoint, according to their custom; we do not blame them.[5] Hammond then discusses, with a wealth of learning, the right of priests to consecrate the chrism: he concludes that it belongs to the bishop alone. And he finishes this part of the discussion by saying that oil in Baptism and chrism in Confirmation are omitted in England because they are not found in Scripture nor in primitive antiquity. And he repeats that we do not reckon Confirmation "*inter Sacramenta a Christo instituta, et ad omnium salutem necessaria.*"[6]

---

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 177.

[2] p. 178.

[3] In four volumes (London, 1674), the *de Confirmatione* is in vol. iii, pp. 861-895. The references in this essay are for the 1661 edition.

[4] "Life," prefixed to vol. i of the 1674 ed. of Hammond's *Works*, p. 21.

Hammond turns next to the Scriptural authority for Confirmation, alleging the passages in Acts viii and xix and Heb. vi, and basing his interpretation on St. Cyprian and St. Chrysostom.[1] He points out that 2 Cor. i. 22 and 1 St. John ii. 27 mention unction, but he thinks that they do not refer to a visible anointing.[2] Holding that in Confirmation the Holy Spirit is given to the baptized, he considers that chrism is not an inappropriate external sign.[3] Point by point, Hammond discusses the patristic evidence adduced by Dallæus, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, Optatus, and the rest. Nor does he omit the hymn-writers, such as Prudentius. But his treatment is throughout somewhat hampered by his having to meet the arguments of an opponent to whom he is always almost affectionately courteous and with whom he is anxious to find grounds of agreement. Thus, he assures Dallæus, once again, that we English do not think: (1) unction is necessary for Confirmation, nor (2) that Confirmation is a sacrament (in the sense in which we use the term).[4]

---

[1] Cap. ii, § ii, p. 31.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 32.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 32.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 40.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 42.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 69.

This remarkable little book is as learned as the great work of Bishop Jeremy Taylor: its drawback is that its learning is cast into an awkward and scholastic mould.

In his *View of the New Directory*, 1645, Hammond had defended Confirmation, in most conciliatory fashion, as "a most ancient Christian custom, tending very much to edification,"[5] emphasizing particularly the solemn profession of Christian faith and obedience by the candidate. Incidentally Hammond declares that it had been "so long and so scandalously neglected in this Kingdom." Baxter later reprinted this passage of Hammond in his Postscript to his own book on Confirmation.[6]

From the Puritan side, almost at the end of their ascendancy, came some interesting works on Confirmation, pleading for its revival in some form.

In 1657 Jonathan Hanmer, Vicar of Instow (who became a Nonconformist in 1662) published his Τελείωσις, or *an Exercitation upon Confirmation*, which went into a second edition next year. He desired its restoration.

Richard Baxter, who had written a preface to Hanmer's book, in answer to a desire for more Scripture proof for the rite, published his treatise *Confirmation and Restauration*, etc., in 1658.[1] The book is marked by Baxter's usual copiousness, but it exhibits also his earnest pastoral zeal, his shrewd good sense, his wide reading, and his breadth of mind. Baxter's main concern is to secure that those baptized as infants should make some solemn profession of their faith before they are admitted to the privileges of adult church membership. Some such ceremony is "the practice of the Universal Church,"[2] and its necessity is illustrated by a wealth of evidence from both Old and New Testament Scriptures. Confirmation is, he allows, a sacrament, in the looser sense of the term, together with Baptism, Absolution, the Lord's Supper, and Ordination, for the "name of sacrament" is "a word that will stretch"; and by Confirmation, Christ, by His ministers, doth "confirm us in our church-state, and invest us with a right to the privileges of the adult."[3] This is, however, for those "that never proved ungodly"; for others Absolution is necessary, and takes the place of Confirmation.[4] Baxter is clear that corroborating Grace is given in Confirmation to all who come to it sincerely, and "the Papists falsely describe our opinion; we do not take it to be a mere catechizing, or receiving the catechized to the Lord's Supper, or to a higher form. . . . We affect not to fly farther from them than we needs must; much less to fly from the ancient practice of the Universal Church. But we must crave their pardon, if we introduce not their Anointing, though ancient."[5] He defends imposition of hands in the ceremony, with copious references to Holy Scripture, quoting, amongst other passages, Acts viii and xix. The allusion in Heb. vi. 2 covers, he holds, Absolution and Ordination as well as Confirmation. He next proceeds to justify Confirmation by prayer and laying on of hands as a practice of the Universal Church "received from the Apostles" from patristic sources, but he would not, for the sake of tender consciences, make it "a matter of flat necessity."[6]

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 77.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 80.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 87.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 11.

[5] *Works*, ed. 1674, i. 156.

[6] *Practical Works*, ed. Orme, xiv. 593.

---

[1] It is reprinted in his *Practical Works*, ed. Orme, xiv. 401-594.

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 421.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 449.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 450, 451.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 452.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 466-469.

He holds that it is unfit that those who have been admitted to Communion should be now confirmed,[1] though later, when he is arguing in favour of the Prayer-book rubrics concerning Confirmation, he writes, "We are agreed with them that stand for common-prayer, that such as are not confirmed be not admitted to the Holy Communion."[2] Baxter is concerned with another aspect of Confirmation. He holds that it may be a means of reconciliation between the separated bodies of Christians. He quotes "that most petulent, insolent Jesuit, Henry Fitz-Simon," as approving the Anglican Canon and rubrics about Confirmation, as "very orthodox, very Catholic, if uttered in good sadness," he thinks that the Presbyterians "cannot be against it," because of Calvin's judgment of it. Congregationalists are, in substance, for it, and many have approved Mr. Hanmer's book; even the Anabaptists, he labours to prove, may be brought to tolerate it.[3] He urges that "the not practising of this [Confirmation] hath cast us into confusion; and the practice of it must be it that must restore our church order, and heal most of our divisions."[4] Baxter urges, further, that Confirmation "was generally received in almost all the churches on earth, till lately. . . . Though the Greeks, I know, do not own the Popish Confirmation, nor have it so formally as they should, or the Papists have corrupted it by their abuse; yet the thing in substance is owned dogmatically by almost all the Christian world: and they must be very singular persons that disown it."[5] Difficulty arises, however, over the minister of Confirmation. To the objection that only bishops may confirm, Baxter replies: "What mean you by bishops? . . . If by a bishop you mean such as our English bishops were . . . I deny that such were ever instituted by Christ."[6] He argues for the right of presbyters to confirm, and quotes the Anglican writers who have defended the validity of presbyterian ordination abroad. "Protestant divines," he says, "are commonly agreed, that Confirmation is not proper to bishops, but may be used by presbyters."[1] In answer to the objection "You will revive the prelatical Confirmation again, which the old Nonconformists were against" he retorts, "We will revive nothing of it, but what was good: the corruption we shall omit." And he details afresh the objections to the ministration of Confirmation as he had known it in his youth.[2] In a Postscript, Baxter is concerned with objections from his fellow Puritans. "I will contend with no man whether the approved profession that I have pleaded for in this book be the very same thing with the ancients' Confirmation. . . . I am sure the thing in question is our duty, or the name not unfit, and that it is the same with the Confirmation owned by the divines of the Reformed Churches, and particularly . . . for the substance," with that established in the Book of Common Prayer.[3] Baxter's first concern, throughout his book, is the pastoral and practical side of the question. He sees the practical need of a solemn recognition of full church membership; the danger of persons slipping into it without some formal and spiritual process. He is aware also of the strength of the argument from church history, and it weighs with him: so does the very real desire to promote unity between Christians. He appears to accept fully Confirmation as the English Church in the Prayer Book ordered it, save in one crucial point: its ministration by the bishop alone.

---

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 479.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 509.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 509-512.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 516.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 522.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 533.

Period 5, 1660-1688. From the Restoration to the Revolution of 1688

The Restoration of King Charles II on May 29, 1660, led to the restoration of the Prayer Book and its system. An attempt to bridge the gulf between the Church and the Puritans was made in the Savoy Conference between the bishops and the Puritan divines in 1661. Meanwhile, incumbents who had only Presbyterian Orders were already applying for ordination as deacons and priests by the bishops. Bishop Bramhall ordained a number of such men in the diocese of York in September 1660, but whether such ordinands were confirmed before ordination there is no evidence.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 534-537.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 539.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 588.

Soon after the King's return the Presbyterian divines had approached him with proposals which included one "that a personal public owning the baptismal covenant might precede an admission to the Lord's Supper,"[2] and that to such only Confirmation (if continued) should be given. The proposals were submitted to the bishops, who to that point replied, "As for Confirmation, and the barring scandalous persons from the Communion, they thought the Church had taken sufficient care of that matter."[3] But the subject did not rest there; in a Royal Declaration issued on October 25, 1660, Charles said: "We will take care that Confirmation be solemnly and rightly performed, by the information and with the consent of the minister of the place, who shall admit none to the Lord's Supper till they have made a credible profession of their faith, and promised obedience to the will of God, according as is expressed in the considerations of the rubric before the Catechism" (§ 5).[4]

At the Conference itself, in 1661, the Puritans delivered their *Exceptions* against the Prayer Book in writing; their particular objections to the Order of Confirmation, eight in number, were for the most part identical with the points urged by Cartwright and the Calvinists of a century before.

1. They objected to the last rubric before the Catechism ("that children, being baptized, have all things necessary for salvation, and be undoubtedly saved") as misleading. The removal of the last sentence had been suggested by the Committee appointed by the House of Lords in 1641.[5] The bishops, in their *Answer*, saw no danger in the words[6]; they were, however, expunged from the 1661 Book.

---

[1] See *Yorks. Arch. Journal*, xxvi. pt. 104, pp. 317, 318. The evidence of the diary of Bishop Cartwright of Chester, for the year 1686-1687, shows that before each of his ordinations the bishop confirmed several of the candidates for the diaconate. See below, pp. 175, 176.

[2] Collier, *Eccles. Hist.*, vii. 403.

[3] Collier, *op. cit.* p. 406.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 413. *Cf.* Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 279.

[5] Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 276. *Cf.* Brightman, *The Anglican Rite*, I. p. clxxxix.

[6] Cardwell, *op. cit.* p. 358.

2. They objected to the rubric after the Catechism that children, so soon as they can say the three forms (Creed, etc.), and know their Catechism, should be brought to the bishop. They alleged that children of four and five would thus be qualified, and that it contradicted the statement in the earlier rubric that Confirmation should be ministered to those "of perfect age." They desired that, according to the recent Royal Declaration, "Confirmation should only be given by consent of the minister of the place."[1] The bishops answered that the points were adequately safeguarded by Canon 61 and the other rubrics,[2] yet the direction as to qualification was modified in the new Book; children are to be of "a competent age," and the formal consent of the curate to the confirmation of a parishioner was required.

3. They saw no need of godparents.[3] The bishops answered curtly that "the compilers of the Liturgy did, and so doth the Church." [4] The rubric was retained.

4. They objected to the sentence in the Prayer (from the Sarum Office), "who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these Thy servants by water and the Holy Ghost, and hast given unto them forgiveness of all their sins," on the ground that "a great number of children at that age, having committed many sins since their baptism, do show no evidence of serious repentance." [5] The bishops answered that the Collect "supposeth, and that truly, that all children were at their baptism regenerate by water and the Holy Ghost, and had given unto them forgiveness of all their sins, and it is charitably presumed that, notwithstanding the frailties and slips of their childhood, they have not totally lost what was in baptism conferred upon them." They added that none living in open sin ought to be confirmed.[6] No change was made.

5. They objected to the rubric before the Imposition of Hands which confined the rite to the bishop. The objection was the old one, that deacons may baptize and priests celebrate, but that only a bishop may confirm, conse-

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 328.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 358.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 328.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 358.
[5] *Ibid.* pp. 328, 329.
[6] *Ibid.* pp. 358, 359.

quently " this seems to put a higher value upon Confirmation than upon Baptism or the Lord's Supper."[1] This was, in fact, an attack upon episcopacy, and as such had been a plank in the Calvinist platform from the first days. It struck also, by implication, at the use of Acts viii and Acts xix, which were constantly alleged, save in the period 1560-1590, in defence of Confirmation by Anglican divines. The bishops answered with the familiar passages from St. Jerome (*adv. Lucifer.*) and St. Cyprian (*Ep.* 73) to prove that " so it was of old," and declared that " our Church doth everywhere profess, as the right, to conform to the catholic usages of the primitive times." They added that the reservation of Confirmation to the bishop " doth argue the dignity of the bishop above the presbyters, . . . but does not argue any excellency in Confirmation above the sacraments," using the last word, it will be observed, in the narrowest sense, viz. of Baptism and the Eucharist. They point out that St. Jerome (*adv. Lvcifer.* cap. 4) draws an exactly opposite conclusion to that of the Puritans from this use, viz. that the most necessary means of salvation are the most easily accessible.[2] No change was made.

6. They objected to the phrases in the post-Confirmation Prayer, " upon whom, after the example of Thy holy Apostles, we have laid our hands, to certify them by this sign of Thy favour," etc. Here were in fact two objections :

> (i) The reference to apostolic practice " both because the Apostles did never use it in that case, as also because the Articles . . . declare it to be a ' corrupt imitation ' of the Apostles' practice. Art. xxv."[3]
>
> (ii) Making imposition of hands a sign certifying God's grace and favour " seems to speak it a sacrament," and contradicts Art. xxv, which says " Confirmation hath no visible sign appointed by God."[4]

The first point, that Confirmation was not to be found in Scripture, was a familiar and principal ground of Calvinist attack. It had been made by Cartwright and met rather timidly by Whitgift, but was emphatically dealt with by Hooker and the subsequent writers, as well as by the bishops at Hampton Court in 1604.

---

[1] Cardwell, *op. cit.* p. 329.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 359.

[3] Misprinted " Acts xxv." in Cardwell.

[4] Cardwell, *op. cit.* p. 329.

The bishops evidently considered that the point has been made sufficiently clear, for they answered simply, "Prayer after the imposition of hands is grounded upon the practice of the Apostles (Heb. vi. 2, and Acts viii. 17)."

To the second point (which had been made at Hampton Court and not really answered there) they replied that the Article does not "say that Confirmation is a corrupt imitation of the Apostles' practice, but that the five commonly called sacraments have ground partly of the corrupt following of Apostles, etc., which may be applied to some other of these 5, but cannot be applied to Confirmation, unless we make the Church speak contradictions."[1]

To the objection that the later words "speak it a sacrament," they say they "know no harm in speaking the language of holy Scripture (Acts viii. 15), 'they laid their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost.'" Imposition of hands, though not a sacrament, yet "is a very fit sign, to certify the persons what is then done for them."[2] No change was made.

7. Finally, they objected to the rubric making Confirmation necessary before Communion so absolutely "as that none should be admitted to it unless they be confirmed."[3]

The bishops answered that there is here no inconvenience "where" Confirmation "may be ordinarily obtained." They considered the objection inconsistent with the second of the *Exceptions*,[4] for they add, "That which you here fault you elsewhere desire,"[5] but in their *Concessions* (§ 14) they granted that to the rubric shall be added "or be ready and desirous to be confirmed,"[6] and this was accordingly done in the new Book.

The Order of Confirmation, after the process of revision by the Convocations had been completed, was lengthened; but the changes made did not alter its doctrinal teaching.

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 359.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 359, 360.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 329, 330.

[4] p. 144, above.

[5] Cardwell, *op. cit.* p. 360.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 363.

It was separated from the Catechism, and its title was altered by the exchange of the words "and come to years of discretion" for the longer "and able to render an account of the faith," etc. A preface, taken from the first and third sections of the earlier explanatory rubric which had preceded the Catechism, was appointed to be read at the opening of the service; but, for some reason, the second section of that rubric which affirmed, as one reason for Confirmation, the gift of strength and defence against temptations to sin, a statement which had been so objectionable to earlier Puritans, was omitted. In place of the public questioning in the Catechism by the bishop, which had hitherto been ordered, was put the formal demand of personal acknowledgment of the baptismal vow, to be answered by each candidate, and the service then followed the previous Order, the only changes being that candidates are directed to kneel while being confirmed and the words of Confirmation "Defend, O Lord, this child" are altered to "Defend, O Lord, this Thy child (or this Thy servant)," an alteration which suggests that candidates of riper years were normally so many as to need special provision.

"The Lord be with you," with its reponse, and the "Our Father" followed the laying on of hands, and the Collect from the Sarum Order for Prime was added immediately before the blessing. The rubrics concerning catechizing were transferred to the end of the Catechism with the change making the formal consent of the curate necessary for a parishioner's Confirmation, and the final rubric was altered from the form "until such time as he can say the Catechism and be confirmed" to "until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed."[1]

Cosin, who upon the Restoration became Bishop of Durham, suggested various other additions to the Office, including an Epistle and Gospel.[2] With them is an address on Confirmation in the bishop's hand, which his editor thought " may have been designed as an introduction to " the present Office, or more probably is a discourse made by the bishop for his own use to be delivered before he administered Confirmation.[1]

---

[1] For the summary of these changes see Brightman, *Anglican Rite*, I. ccvi. *seq.*, ii. 791, *seq.* Proctor and Frere, *New History of Bk. of C.P.* (1902), pp. 198, 605, 607.

[2] They are printed in Blunt's *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, p. 440.

This discourse begins by affirming that Confirmation is held by the Church of Rome to be a sacrament, but we " who by the grace of God are numbered among the reformed Churches " hold it to be none; yet we hold it " a sacred and a solemn action of religion," which being accompanied by fervent prayer, " will convey the graces of the Holy Spirit to those duly prepared." The address then, often word for word, follows Hooker's chapter on Confirmation in Book v. ch. 61 of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* to the end of § 8, *i.e.* it omits the sections which deal with the specific Puritan objections, and is thus practically an extract from Hooker. The fragment is interesting as being the first known example of a Confirmation address in English, and it further suggests that the standard of intelligence in the bishopric of Durham was exceedingly high if its youth were considered capable, as evidently they were, of following the superb prose of Hooker. Hooker's patristic quotations were, naturally, omitted by the bishop.

Herbert Thorndike, Prebendary of Westminster, already mentioned, was at least as learned as Cosin and a far deeper and more original thinker. He treated Confirmation in three of his works.

In the *Government of Churches, a Discourse pointing at the Primitive Form* published first in 1641 and again in 1650, in the course of his remarks on Penance, he deals with imposition of hands, and he quotes St. Augustine and Tertullian for its use in Confirmation, to show that the ceremony is a prayer for the Holy Ghost, " a ceremony of benediction, imploring the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, which it representeth." [2] Thorndike is the first English theologian to call attention to the fact that the laying on of hands represents the overshadowing of the

---

[1] It is printed in his *Works*, Anglo-Cath. Library, v. 526-8. On its probable use see the note (a) on p. 526.

[2] *Works*, Anglo-Cath. Library, i. 58, 59.

Holy Spirit. In his *Right of the Church in a Christian State*, 1649 (reprinted in 1670 and again in 1841), Thorndike explained more fully the meaning of imposition of hands: it was "nothing else but a ceremony of that benediction, which signifieth, that those acts to which it is granted, are allowed [*i.e.* approved] and authorized by the public power of the Church. So imposition of hands in Confirmation is the admission of him that is confirmed to the Communion of the visible Church,"[1] and having noted the use of this ceremony in the Gospels and in the Old Testament, he considered that in Confirmation, Penance, and Ordination "it was received by the ordinance of the Apostles."[2] In 1659 Thorndike's great work, the *Epilogue*, designed to promote the unity of the different religious bodies in England on the basis of the primitive Catholic Church, was published,[3] and in it he treats Confirmation specially from the angle of one devoted to the cause of reunion. The unity of the Church lay originally in the Apostolate and resides in the successors of the Apostles, therefore he is led to consider the power of confirming, exercised by bishops.

Having instanced Acts viii. 14-17 and xix. 1-7, he urges that, in order that "Baptism may have its effect, that is give the Holy Ghost, the allowance of the Apostles (upon whose government the unity of the Church dependeth) is requisite; which allowance their prayers for the Holy Ghost, and imposition of hands, implieth and presupposeth."[4] It is reasonable to suppose that the gift of the Holy Ghost, promised to them that are baptized, depends, from the New Testament evidence, upon the blessing of the Apostles. Else why should St. Peter and St. John travel to Samaria to do what, on the contrary hypothesis, they had no need to do at Jerusalem where they were? Or why, in the first instance, was the imposition of the hands of the Apostles necessary "to procure some the Holy Ghost, and not others."

All men know, he continues, "how ancient, how general the custom hath been in the Church for bishops to confirm the baptized, by praying for the effect of it, which is the

---

[1] *Works*, Anglo-Cath. Library, i. 417.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 535.
[3] On this see his *Life*, by A. W. Haddan, in *Works*, vi. 215 *seq.*
[4] *Ibid.* iv. 371.

Holy Ghost, with imposition of hands; professing thereby, that they own their faith and baptism, and acknowledge them for part of their flock, as acknowledged by them, for their pastors."[1]

It is at Confirmation that those who, having been baptized as infants, make profession of their faith and are secured that they do "profess the faith of the whole Church" by being there approved by their bishop "through whom they have communion with the whole Church." For as originally the unity of the Church was secured by the faith of the bishop, so Confirmation was the only means to assure the flock that they held the faith of the whole Church, "which owned their bishop and his faith."[2] The point that Thorndike insists upon is that by Confirmation the baptized are integrated with the bishop, and therefore with the whole Church of whose faith and unity the bishop is the guardian and the symbol.

In 1662 Thorndike, who had been a member of the Savoy Conference and had taken a considerable part in the revision of the Prayer Book, published his *Just Weights and Measures*, to illustrate the practical application of his view put forth in the *Epilogue*. In chapter xviii he deals with "Offices of the Church, which the fathers have called sacraments," and first with Confirmation. He holds that these five offices "are to be solemnized with those ceremonies for which they are, without any cause of offence, called 'sacraments' by the fathers of the Church."[3] He had previously, in the *Epilogue*, pointed out in what sense they might be called sacraments.[4]

He now points out that all are agreed that it is necessary for those baptized in infancy to give an account of their faith before they receive Communion.

Why, then, should bishops alone confirm and not presbyters, who are allowed to baptize and celebrate? "The answer," he replies, "is easy. For neither is baptism and the Eucharist ministered but by authority from the bishop. . . . He that thinks there was a reason why St. Peter and St. John should come to confirm those whom the deacon, St. Philip, had baptized, can never want a reason why the bishop alone should do it. For he cannot minister the means of salvation alone. But the faith and unity of his Church with the rest, is not to be preserved without him. Therefore the gift of the Holy Ghost, which baptism promiseth, dependeth upon the bishop's blessing; because it dependeth upon the unity of the Church." That was the reason why heretics and schismatics in the early Church, on being received, were blessed by the bishop, because their departure from unity had barred the effect of their baptism.[1] And this point leads him to assert the sense in which Confirmation is a sacrament: if it, with Orders and Penance, "be offices in which the Church is indebted to God and to His Church, if the effect of them be of such consequence that they have been always solemnized with the imposition of hands, that ceremony shall be enough to make them sacraments," yet not such as Baptism and Communion.[2] In his little work, *The Reformation of the Church of England better than that of the Council of Trent*, written between 1670 and his death in 1672, and first published in 1854,[3] Thorndike, when he comes to Confirmation, holds the same position. To preserve the unity of the Church it is necessary to be subject to the bishop of every church. To resist the bishop when he is authorized by the Church is to call in question the unity of the Church. That is the reason for Confirmation, and it appears in the account in Acts viii. That was why baptized heretics needed not rebaptism but did need reconfirmation. It was a defect in the whole Church that when infant baptism became the rule there was no catechizing of such children "when they came to profess themselves." In this respect the order of the English Church is excellent "though zeal be wanting to bring it to effect by practice."[4] Once more he insists that the controversy about the number of the sacraments turns simply on the meaning of the term, and that in the Latin Fathers the word "extends to signify all sacred ceremonies"[5] (and therefore Confirmation), and he has a racy sentence in which he declares that "those wretches . . . that would solemnize ordination and Confirmation without the solemnity of imposition of hands, deserve to be sent to the Cyclopes as brutish and barbarous."[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.* iv. 372.

[2] *Ibid.* iv. 373.

[3] *Works*, v. 201.

[4] *Ibid.* iv. 751, 2.

---

[1] *Works*, v. 202.

[2] *Ibid.* v. 208.

[3] In the Anglo-Catholic Library, v. 491-601.

[4] *Works*, v. 556, 557.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 584.

In one detail Thorndike differs from most of the Anglican divines from Hooker onwards who have treated of the Scriptural proof of Confirmation: he rejects the often-quoted passage in Heb. vi. 2 as having any reference to it. The passage occurs in a tract on *The Church's Power of Excommunication*, which he never printed, and wrote, apparently, at some date before 1659. He there insists that no one "ever heard Confirmation reckoned among principles of faith," and the words refer, he considers, to a catechizing of the baptized.[2] Certainly, in his Scripture grounds for Confirmation in his works, though he often mentions the two passages in the Acts, Thorndike never refers to the text in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

In one of his earliest works, *The Service of God at Religious Assemblies*, published in 1642, Thorndike treated of Confirmation, but his points there are elaborated in his later books. He insists that the practice, "being lineally descended from the practice of the Apostles," is "an evident mark of the succession of the Apostles, preserved in Bishops," and points out that Calvin (he quotes the familiar passage) and Cassander agree that examination of the baptized is necessary and the attempt of "our pretended presbyteries" proves it.[3] The passage is of no special interest, unlike his other important contribution to the discussion, which considered Confirmation from the point of view of reunion, a field in which no Anglican divines have followed him, until a theologian of our day, whose work lies outside the period of this essay.[4]

[1] *Ibid.* v. p. 584.

[2] *Works*, vi. 29.

[3] *Ibid.* i. 850, 851.

[4] I refer to the *First Book of the Irenicum of John Forbes*, edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn (Cambridge, 1923). Mr. Selwyn, in his very valuable Introduction, especially p. 22, and in his Appendix III, p. 248, insists on the very point which Thorndike had in mind, the importance of Confirmation in the question of Reunion, because Confirmation is, "*par excellence*, the Sacrament of the Church's Unity" (p. 248). Mr. Selwyn is, I think, the first English divine, since Thorndike, to bring out this point, and he does it independently of him.

That the question of Confirmation and of the preparation for it by catechizing was a very practical one is shown by the publication in 1664 of a little book, 'Ενιαυτός, *Or a Course of Catechizing*[1] which prints, after the Directions for Catechizing, The Order for Confirmation, but with a much longer Preface than in the 1661 Book. It also prints a shorter form of the service. A second edition, enlarged, issued in 1674, was illustrated by copper plates. The Order as printed is that of the 1604 Prayer Book. The special interest of the 1674 edition[2] is a woodcut of a Bishop administering Confirmation. He wears a rochet, chimere, and scarf, and, on his head, a close-fitting coif, and he is standing. In his left hand he holds a book, his right hand he is laying on the head of a candidate kneeling before him, and he certainly appears to be signing the candidate's forehead, though, so far as I know, there is no evidence for the use of that ceremony at this period, other than that mentioned above.

Greatest of all the English books on Confirmation is the work of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Χρῖσις Τελειωτική,[3] *A Discourse of Confirmation*, published in 1663, which a distinguished theologian describes as "by far the richest and most edifying work upon the subject (Confirmation) with which I am acquainted."[4] The book is dedicated to the Viceroy of Ireland, James, Duke of Ormonde,[5] and the Epistle Dedicatory is a good example of Taylor's style. The bishop laments the state of "this very poor Church" of Ireland, and hopes that "the reduction of the holy rite of Confirmation into use and holy practice" may help to remedy it. Apart from its spiritual value the rite will

---

[1] London, published by James Cotterell for Henry Marsh.

[2] I owe the knowledge of both editions of this book to the Lord Bishop of Truro, when he was Superior of the Community of the Resurrection. A copy of each edition is in the Library at Mirfield.

[3] *i.e.* "The Unction that makes Perfect," or "the Perfecting Unction"; so Dr. A. J. Mason, in his *Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, 1891, p. 380. The title is derived, Dr. Mason points out, from a passage in the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* of the so-called Denys the Areopagite.

[4] Dr. A. J. Mason, *op. cit.* p. ix.

[5] The book is in the *Works* of Bishop J. Taylor (ed. Heber, in fifteen vols. 3rd ed. 1839), xi. 215-297.

" be a means of endearing the persons of the prelates to their flocks." Not only many individuals, " but even the whole Church of Ireland, hath need of Confirmation," for " most of us " have " contended for false religions and unchristian propositions " and the Fathers often have declared that persons returning from sects and heresies into the bosom of the Church should not be rebaptized, but[1] should be confirmed. The *Epistle* is enriched by quotations from various ancient authors, and is adorned with glowing and picturesque phrases. " Some wise and good men," says the bishop, " have piously believed, that when baptized Christians are confirmed, and solemnly blessed by the bishop, that then it is that a special angel-guardian is appointed to keep their souls from the assaults of the spirits of darkness," and such a supposition " is not disagreeable to the intention of this rite."[2] Confirmation " was ancient, and long before popery entered into the world," " indeed, the greatest enemies to it " are " the bigots of the Roman Church," and " from them the presbyterians." Not only, he says, does the English Church retain the rite, but " the Lutheran and Bohemian Churches do observe it carefully, and it is recommended and established in the harmony of the Protestant confessions."[3] Taylor comes near to Thorndike when he says that Confirmation is " a great instrument of union of hearts, and will prove an effective deletory to schism," but he does not work out the point.[4]

The bishop treats Confirmation under eight divisions, an Introduction and seven sections. The Introduction deals with the work of the Holy Spirit in redeemed humanity, particularly in Baptism, but " until we receive the Spirit of obsignation or confirmation, we are but babes in Christ."[5] " The holy right [*sic* for rite] of confirmation is a Divine ordinance, and it produces divine effects, and is ministered by Divine persons. . . . At first, all that were baptized were also confirmed: and ever since, all good people that have understood it, have been very zealous for it."[6] But it has been neglected, and not understood, and so neglected yet more. Therefore, the bishop will give reasons why the people ought to love it and desire it.

---

[1] *Op. cit.* pp. ccxviii-ccxx.
[2] *Ibid.* p. ccxxv.
[3] *Ibid.* p. ccxxvi.
[4] *Ibid.* ccxxxvi.
[5] Bishop Taylor, *Works*, xi. 230.
[6] *Ibid.* p. 231.

In section 1 he treats of the authority for Confirmation. The Roman Catholics reckon it a sacrament, but they are not consistent, for " the English Jesuits generally, " and some others, have " disputed it almost into contempt." Whether it be a sacrament or no, he considers it useless to dispute, for it can never be proved to be such an one as Baptism and the Eucharist. However, the Fathers certainly call it a Sacrament " in a large, symbolical, and general sense." But that it is " a Divine ordinance to purposes spiritual, that it comes from God, and ministers in our way to God," is all we are concerned with.[1]

Taylor bases the argument from the authority of Scripture more broadly than any divine before him ; he cites first the descent of the Holy Spirit upon our Lord after His baptism (St. Mark i. 10 and parallels), following St. Cyril and Optatus.[2]

Secondly, he bases it on our Lord's words to Nicodemus (St. John iii. 5), " Unless a man be born of water and of the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," and fortifies his exegesis with considerable patristic authority, that of St. Cyprian and St. Augustine amongst others.[3] He meets the objection that the words were spoken too early, before Confirmation began, using amongst others the argument that the words are *designativa*, " as the sixth chapter of St. John is of the blessed Eucharist." [4] The other objection, that if these words are true of Confirmation, then it " is as necessary as Baptism and without it ordinarily no man can be saved," he meets by admitting it, when Confirmation may ordinarily be had.[5] " The use of it is greatly profitable ; the neglect is inexcusable ; but the contempt is damnable." [6]

Bishop Taylor then treats the other passages of Scripture, Acts viii. 14-17 and xix. 1-6, illuminating them by patristic comments as he goes, and finally, Heb. vi. 1, 2, where Confirmation " is established and passed into a Christian doctrine"[1]; it "is reckoned as a part of the foundation, and, therefore, they who deny it dig up foundations."[2] He proceeds to show that the words cannot refer to absolution of penitents or to ordination, and he quotes St. Chrysostom and then Calvin to show that the passage refers to Confirmation, concluding that "this doctrine of confirmation, or imposition of hands, is apostolical and Divine."[3]

---

[1] *Works*, xi. pp. 233, 234.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 234-238.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 238-241.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 242.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 244, 245.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 246.

Section 2 proves that Confirmation is a perpetual and never-ceasing Ministry, against those who contend that "it belonged to the days of wonder and extraordinary." The Holy Ghost was promised "to abide with the Church for ever,"[4] and St. Peter, in his sermon in Acts ii. 38, 39, promised that the Gift of the Holy Ghost was "to you and to your children," etc. St. Paul referred to this in Eph. i. 13, and they would well understand his reference, remembering what was done to themselves by him but a while before (Acts xix. 6).[5] The Bishop, in this connexion, touches very pertinently on the relation of the outward to the inward: "by the outward God so usually and regularly gives the inward, that as no man is to rely upon the external ministry, as if the *opus operatum* would do the whole duty; so no man is to neglect the external, because the internal is the more principal. The mistake in this particular hath caused great contempt of the sacraments and rituals of the Church, and is the ground of the Socinian errors in these questions."[6] For the rest, the Bishop deals with the question of the external signs which had followed the gift of the Holy Spirit in the first days, as Hooker had done, only more fully and with a still wider reference to Scripture, and to the Fathers, and to human experience.[7]

Section 3 of the book is historical, and is concerned to prove that "the Holy Rite of Imposition of Hands for giving the Holy Spirit, or Confirmation, was actually continued and practised by all the succeeding ages of the purest and primitive Church."

Theophilus of Antioch (whose work dates from *circa*

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 248.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 249.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 251.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 252.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 252, 253.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 254.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 254-257.

A.D. 180)[1] derives the name of Christian from this chrism, "this Confirmation of baptized persons,"[2] and then in order the Bishop marshals the testimony of Tertullian (A.D. 200), St. Cyprian (A.D. 250), St. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, St. Dionysius the Areopagite, Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, Melchiades, Optatus, and St. Cyril (these two having been already quoted, are referred to), St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Basil, Theodoret, Urban I, St. Jerome, St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, and Pacian. "I shall add no more," he says, "lest I overset the article, and make it suspicious by too laborious a defence,"[3] but it remains a remarkable witness to Bishop Taylor's scholarship. He adds evidence that Confirmation was decreed by the Councils of Eliberis, Laodicea, Orleans, and the first and second Councils of Arles. He sums up this impressive section by saying that the witness of many Fathers teaching this doctrine, and of so many more as were assembled in six Councils, "all giving witness to this holy rite, and that in pursuance also of Scripture, are too great a cloud of witnesses to be despised by any man that calls himself a Christian."[4]

Section 4 deals with the point that "the Bishops were always and the only Ministers of Confirmation," and is necessarily historical. St. Chrysostom, St. Dionysius, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Jerome are all cited, and Pope Innocent I, Optatus, Melchiades, as well as the alleged exceptions to the rule from St. Ambrose and Amalarius, and the investigation is carried on past Innocent III, "a great canonist and of great authority," to Richard, Archbishop of Armagh, Wyclif, Thomas of Walden, and the Jesuits, and finally to the doctors of the Sorbonne, and he sums up: "But for the main: it was ever called 'confirmatio episcopalis et impositio manuum episcoporum'; which our English word well expresses, and perfectly retains the use; we know it by the common name of 'bishoping of children.'"[5] But he is careful to point out that, though the bishop is the divinely appointed minister of Confirmation, " I do not say that God is tied to this way ; He cannot be tied but by Himself : and, therefore, Christ gave a special commission to Ananias to baptize and confirm St. Paul, and He gave the Spirit to Cornelius even before he was baptized, and He ordained St. Paul to be an apostle without the ministry of man. But this I say, that though God can make ministers extraordinary, yet man cannot ; and they that go about to do so usurp the power of Christ, and snatch from His hand what He never intended to part with."[1]

---

[1] Mason, *Relation of Confirmation*, etc., p. 330 *n*.

[2] Bishop Taylor, *Works*, xi. p. 258.

[3] These testimonies cover pp. 258-264.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 265.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 273. The section covers pp. 265-274.

Section 5 is concerned with the statement that " the whole Procedure or Ritual of Confirmation is by Prayer and Imposition of Hands." This leads to the discussion of unction, and Prudentius and St. Cyril are quoted for the use of chrism. " I find in him," says the Bishop, " and in some late synods other pretty significations and allusions made by this ceremony of chrisms," and he admits " that this was the ancient ceremony is without doubt, and that the Church hath power to do so hath no question, and, I add, it was not unreasonable," yet the Church is at liberty and " hath with sufficient authority omitted it in our ministrations." He notes that in the Prayer Book of 1549 the confirmed were signed on the forehead. " I do not find it since forbidden, or revoked by any expression or intimation, saving only that it is omitted in our latter offices ; and therefore it may seem to be permitted to the discretion of the bishops, but yet not to be used unless where it may be for edification, and where it may be, by the consent of the Church, at least by interpretation."[2]

Section 6 deals with the " many great Graces and Blessings consequent to the worthy Reception and due Ministry of Confirmation." Briefly, the Bishop says, these are summed up by the words in the Acts : " they received the Holy Ghost." Just as we believe one baptism for the remission of sins, so we believe " one confirmation for the obtaining this virtue from on high, this strength of the Spirit."[3] He quotes St. Thomas Aquinas and Gerson very aptly, and various of the Fathers and even " a late

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 273.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 277, 278.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 278.

Synod at Rheims."[1] Briefly, we receive strength and the seal of our salvation, blessings which the Bishop sets forth with rare beauty and eloquence. And he meets the practical objection, "We see no such things as you talk of, and find the confirmed people the same after as before," and meets it very wisely. First, "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation," and the objection is as valid against Baptism and the Eucharist as against Confirmation. Secondly, if we do not find the effects of the Spirit in Confirmation, it is our faults. "For He is received by moral instruments," and the Bishop follows the path of Hooker in his teaching that the Sacraments are not magical but moral means. Further, he translates 2 Cor. i. 21 in description of this mystery. "Now He which confirmeth or stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts."[2] St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact all expound this passage of this "rite and sacramental," and St. John of Damascus as that in this mystery "Christos nos efficit": He makes us His anointed ones, and Bishop Taylor boldly applies the text, "Nolite tangere Christos Meos" ("touch not My anointed"). "For when we have this signature of the Lord upon us, the devils cannot come near to hurt us, unless we consent to their temptations, and drive the Holy Spirit of the Lord from us."[3]

The Seventh and last Section deals with "Preparation to Confirmation and the Circumstances of Receiving it."[4]

The Bishop asks, "Why do we confirm little children?" To allege the practice of infant baptism is, as he shows, no answer. His reply to the question is: Primitive practice, which, as time went on, grew diverse. "Aquinas, Bonaventure, and some others say that it is best that they [*i.e.* children] be confirmed in infancy." And this, in fact, is "most agreeable with the primitive practice, that if they were baptized in infancy, they should then also be confirmed."[5]

Others say "that to confirm them of riper years is with more edification," hence the requirement of the Canon Law that they should be *perfectæ ætatis*—of full age, upon which the gloss says, "twelve years old." The reason alleged is that they may come fasting, and must make public confession of their faith. That they should do so, says the Bishop, "is matter of great edification," but the delay is not so edifying.

---

[1] Bishop Taylor, *Works*, xi. p. 283.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 286.

[3] *Op. cit.* p. 287.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 287.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 289.

There is a third way "which the Church of England and Ireland follows, and that is that after infancy, but yet before they understand too much of sin, and when they can competently understand the fundamentals of religion, then it is good to bring them to be confirmed, that the Spirit of God may prevent their youthful sins."[1] The Bishop quotes the Law of Eadgar against delaying Confirmation; "that is," he says, "as is best expounded by the perpetual practice almost ever since." "If it hath been omitted (as of late years it hath been too much) . . . it may be taken at any age, even after they have received the Lord's Supper," which, as he has observed, was the case with the Apostles. About the age of Confirmation he is clear: "the sooner the better: I mean after that reason begins to dawn: but ever it must be taken care of . . . that the children be catechized and well instructed in the fundamentals of their religion."[2]

But "in the Latin Churches they admit children in some ripeness of age," and to this agree St. Augustine, Gualfridus Strabo, Ruardus of Louvain, "and Mr. Calvin."

Catechizing was ever the practice of the primitive Church, and exorcizing means really, the Bishop insists, catechizing, and quotes Fathers to prove his point: "catechisms are the best exorcisms."[3] It is for lack of this that the youth "learn to swear before they can pray, and to lie as soon as they can speak," and the Bishop pleads, with touching force, for early instruction of children. "A little thing will fill a child's head: teach them to say their prayers, tell them the stories of the life and death of Christ, cause them to love the holy Jesus with their first love, make them afraid of a sin."[4]

---

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 290.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 291.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 292.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 293.

The Bishop would have it remembered that in the last rubric of the office of Confirmation "it is made into a law that 'none should be admitted to the holy Communion, until such time as he could say the catechism, and be confirmed,'"[1] and this was notoriously a law and custom in the primitive Church. He makes "a little inquiry" whether Confirmation can be repeated, and shows that it cannot, and he concludes his treatise with an exhortation to the confirmed to remember their high calling. He quotes St. Ambrose, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Augustine, and the first verse of the hymn of Prudentius:

> Servant of God, remember
>   The hallowed font's bedewing,
> The seal of Confirmation
>   Thine inner man renewing.[2]

Such was, briefly, the fullest treatment of Confirmation, on its doctrinal, historical, and practical sides, put forth by any theologian of the English Church; and no Anglican divine since has ever approached, let alone rivalled, Bishop Jeremy Taylor's work. Thorndike alone touches a side of the doctrine which Taylor does not treat, but no one before Taylor, not even Hooker himself, explored so completely the scriptural and patristic references for the rite, nor dealt with it so practically and so devotionally. After Bishop Taylor have arisen, in this respect, none like him. Perhaps the strangest result of this remarkable contribution to Anglican theology is that the "ministers of Confirmation," the bishops, in the following century, seem to have been, if not ignorant of, at least practically uninfluenced by, the learning and strength of this great book. Yet it would be hard to find a more perfect example in a small compass of the essential Anglican appeal to Scripture and the primitive Church, and to find it made by a man of like genius, eloquence, and profoundly holy life.

After the brilliance of Jeremy Taylor's work all lights burn dim, but the period produced some further contributions to the subject, the first, *Of Episcopal Confirmation in Two Discourses*, by B. Canfield, Rector of Aylestone, near Leicester, published in 1682[1] and dedicated to the author's " very much honoured Diocesan," Thomas Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln. The book is made up of two sermons enlarged, the first having been preached at Bishop Barlow's Visitation at Leicester in 1679. Dr. Thomas Barlow, who held the see of Lincoln from 1675 to 1691, was a scholar, a Calvinist, and a bishop who neglected his diocese. Mr. Canfield, in his Address to the Courteous Reader, has a deep sense " of the too great neglect and the general need of Confirmation among the people," and his sermon, preached on the text Heb. vi. 2, was intended for the better preparation of those who should have been confirmed at the Visitation, had the Bishop been able to visit in person, which he was not. Canfield deals with :

---

[1] The Bishop was quoting the book of 1604-1661; the rubric was altered at the last Revision; see above.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 296. The translation is that from *Prime and Hours.* Bishop Taylor quotes the original.

(1) The names for the Rite. It is a Confirmation on God's part and on ours : we confirm our baptismal covenant, and seek strength to keep it, and God confirms the blessing of His Covenant.

(2) He deals with the scriptural authority, citing Acts viii and xix ; and quotes Canon 60 as showing that the Church holds it for Apostolical. He proceeds to answer those who have " declared against " it " as a *Relique of Papist Superstition*."[2]

In favour of the ceremony he quotes Calvin, in the constantly cited passage, Beza (who, however, but mentions it and passes it over without comment)[3] and other authorities of the school, " Chemnitius "[4] (*i.e.* Chemnitz), the Lutheran, the Waldenses in 1504 and 1532, and he gives an account of the form of Confirmation practised by the Bohemian Brethren.[5] Finally, he cites the treatises on Confirmation by the Puritans, Jonathan Hanmer, and Richard Baxter.

(3) He deals with the ceremony itself and its minister. He greatly desires " in larger Dioceses a Delegated Power by way of Jurisdiction," a revival of " the Antient Chore-

---

[1] It was published at London in octavo form.

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 23.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 25.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 28.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 31.

piscopi," in order that Confirmation may be given more readily.[1]

(4) He treats of the qualification for Confirmation, and quotes St. Thomas Aquinas.[2]

(5) He concludes with the benefits of the rite: to receive it is to be "promoted to a higher Form in the School of Christ," and for the Gift given he quotes Bishop Taylor's translation of Melchiades.

In an Appendix, Mr. Canfield considers the objections to Confirmation[3] made by Thomas Cartwright, and the answers to them by Hooker and Hammond.

The second sermon is a "practical discourse to a Country Audience, to prepare them for their Bishop's Confirmation," and is entitled "St. Barnabas, His Exhortation, to Those whom he confirmed at Antioch,"[4] the text being Acts xi. 23 ("who, when he was come, and had seen the grace of God, was glad, and exhorted them all, that with purpose of heart they would draw unto the Lord"). The country audience must have been greatly impressed if the preacher quoted (as he does in the printed book) the Old Testament in Latin and the New Testament in Greek. The point of the sermon is that this "purpose of heart" must be a personal act, sincere and honest; the personal and subjective side of the rite is emphasized almost to the exclusion of the objective. As in the previous sermon, the author shows himself extremely well read in the literature of Confirmation, and quotes Erasmus (Preface to the *Paraphrase of St. Matthew*) on the renewal of vows. Canfield's book evidently became an authority, for it is referred to by Archbishop Secker in his monograph on Confirmation, written at some date between 1733 and 1750, though not printed till 1769.

In 1674 Dr. William Falkner, in his *Libertas Ecclesiastica*, a work so popular that it passed into a fourth edition in 1683, writes of Confirmation: "the obtaining the strengthening grace of the Spirit was in an especial manner designed by the Apostles' imposition of hands, as is declared by Irenæus; and was justly esteemed by St. Austin, that the Holy

---

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 44.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 49.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 60-70.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 71.

Ghost was received, where no miraculous gifts are bestowed."[1]

Another contribution of this period is from the famous preacher, Dr. Robert South, Canon of Christ Church and Prebendary of Westminster. It occurs in a sermon written for a solemn meeting in Westminster Abbey, "of such as had been bred at Westminster school," which was to have been held in 1685, but the death of Charles II prevented it.[2] South, having emphasized the importance of catechizing, asks, "When they are thus catechized, what is to be done next? Why, then, let them be brought to the bishop of the diocese to be confirmed by him, since none else, no, not all the presbyters of a diocese (nor Presbyterians neither), can perform this apostolical act and office upon them." A bishop, South is clear, "can no more confirm than ordain by proxy: these being acts purely and incommunicably episcopal."

"The Church of Rome," he continues, "makes Confirmation a sacrament; and, though the Church of England does not affirm it to be such, yet it owns it of divine and apostolical institution. And as to the necessity of it, I look upon it as no less than a completion of baptism in such as outlive their childhood; and for that reason called by the ancients τελείωσις. It is, indeed, a man's owning that debt in person which passed upon him in his baptism by representation; and his ratifying the promises of his sureties, by his personal acknowledgment of the obligation. It is also expressly instituted for the collation of those peculiar assistances and gifts of the Spirit, by the imposition of episcopal hands, which the rubric represents as requisite to bear him through his Christian course and conflict with comfort and success. For till a person be confirmed, he cannot regularly and ordinarily partake of that high and soul-supporting ordinance, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. And these are the considerations which render the confirmation of children necessary, and the neglect of it scandalous, unchristian, and utterly unjustifiable upon any account whatever."[1] South holds that "the grand rebellion" of 1641, by "unhinging the minds of most of the nation," is partly answerable for the neglect of parents to see that their children are confirmed, but "there should be episcopal visitations more than once in three years, if it were only for the sake of confirmations." The judges, he observes, "go two circuits yearly," and some are apt to think that no less care and labour ought to be employed in carrying on the discipline of the gospel than in dispensing the benefits of the law."[2] And he concludes the subject by urging the necessity of more frequent confirmations.

---

[1] *Libertas Ecclesiastica*, lib. ii, cap. 4, sec. 3, quoted by Jackson, *Hist. of Confirmation*, p. 36.

[2] *Sermons*, by Robert South, D.D., 5 vols. ed. (Oxford, 1842), iii. 69.

Another contribution of this period is also a sermon in form, though in fact a short monograph by the well-known Dr. George Hickes, then Dean of Worcester. It was preached, the editor says, "before 1688" (after which Hickes was deprived as a Nonjuror); it was not published until 1726.[3] Its title is *Confirmation of Divine Original*, and its text is "And of laying on of hands," from Heb. vi. 2. Hickes finds it necessary to show that "even Mr. Calvin" understands the reference of the text to be to Confirmation[4]; he himself holds that Confirmation is "a solemn rite or ceremony for conferring the Holy Ghost." It is divine because it was instituted by the Apostles, and whether a rule be "mediately or immediately" from Christ "it matters not."[5] Hickes takes five points:

(i) He shows Confirmation to be Apostolical from Acts viii and xix, and from Eph. i. 13 (so "the most learned interpreters think")[6] and Eph. iv. 30, our Lord's Baptism and the words to Nicodemus in St. John iii. This section of the sermon is very clearly based on Bishop Jeremy Taylor.

He next quotes patristic evidence to show that Confirmation was always held and practised in the universal Church, and shows that tradition and reason reinforce the fact he is insisting on.

---

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 89.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 90.

[3] In *A Volume of Posthumous Discourses*, etc., ed. N. Spinckes (London, 1726).

[4] *Op. cit.* p. 29.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 34.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 37.

(ii) He shows that the Apostles, and their successors the bishops, were the proper ministers for Confirmation, whence "it came to pass that Confirmation in our language is called the *Bishopping* of the people."[1]

(iii) The external part consists in prayer and imposition of hands. Hickes mentions instances of imposition of hands in both Old and New Testaments, and points out that "the Scriptures compare receiving the Holy Ghost to an anointing with oil," consequently "in the next age after the Apostles,[2] the Church ordained the confirmed persons to be anointed with oil or ointment at Confirmation," and he thinks that "so far there was no harm." But this developed, he holds, into using "superstitious and costly ointments and balsams,"[3] which they sent to priests to anoint the baptized with, "and so by degrees this holy rite came to be perverted and neglected, till our most wise and religious reformers restored it to its primitive and apostolical use and simplicity."[4]

Here the learned Dean shows himself curiously ill-informed in the history of the rite, both in the West generally and in England in particular.

(iv) Hickes next treats of the effects of Confirmation, extraordinary and ordinary. The ordinary effect of Confirmation is "strengthening or corroborating grace"; it is the "perfecting of baptismal grace," "a further reception of that Spirit of sanctification by which we were regenerated and born of God."[5]

Infant Confirmation is not the Church's practice, but candidates should come to it "as soon as they can competently understand the fundamentals of religion, and before they understand too much of sin." He reinforces this by citing our Lord's words, "Suffer little children to come unto Me."

The Dean concludes with some practical applications. First, to beware of those men who cry down the practice as *popish* and *superstitious.* Some do so because they are opposed to the episcopal office, others have taught that it was of human invention, others that it was a trick by which the bishops could keep the people in dependence on themselves. Others have taught that "every minister might confirm."[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 3.

[2] So Bishop Pearson held that chrism was practised "immediately after the Apostles" (*Lectures in Act. Apost.* v. 6, quoted by Keble in note to Hooker, v. lxi. § 6).

[3] *Op. cit.* p. 45. [4] *Ibid.* p. 46. [5] *Ibid.* p. 48.

Secondly, if Confirmation be apostolical and the bishops the proper ministers of it, it is a great sin in any bishop to neglect it. So (since bishops are but men) our Church binds them to confirm every three years. He thanks God "that we have a bishop conscientiously careful in performing this."[2]

Thirdly, it is a grievous sin to neglect or despise Confirmation, and a great danger also.

He ends by addressing those who are to bring their children, on the next Lord's Day, to receive the Holy Spirit in this ordinance and then those of riper years who also are coming to be confirmed.

The sermon owes a very great deal to Bishop Taylor's book, which is, in some sections, reproduced *verbatim.* It is interesting as showing the teaching a parish priest was giving to a London congregation (Hickes was Vicar of All Hallows, Barking, 1680–1686) at the end of Charles II's reign.

Such being the formal teaching of English divines from the Restoration to the Revolution, it remains to test it by the Visitation Articles for the period. They begin in 1662. In that year the Archbishop of York, Accepted Frewen, inquires, "Doth he [*i.e.* the curate] prepare the younge Men and Maidens of the Parish to be confirmed by the Bishop ?" and, about parishioners, "Are there any above the age of 16 years in your Parish and especially that have been examined by your Minister in the Catechism before, that do not come to the Lord's Supper ?"[1] Cosin, at Durham in the same year, inquires about instructing the youth in the Catechism,[2] and whether the householders cause their children and servants to learn it. "And when they are well instructed in that Catechism, are they sent or brought to the Bishop at fit and convenient times to be confirmed ?"[3]

---

[1] *Op. cit.* pp. 49-51.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 52. The sermons in this volume show, Bishop Spinckes says, the doctrines Hickes "constantly preached to his parish before the Revolution" (Preface, p. iv). Hickes held only two parishes—All Hallows, Barking, 1680-1686, then Alvechurch, Worcs, from 1686 to his deprivation. The bishop referred to was, I presume, Henry Compton, Bishop of London, 1675-1713, a very diligent prelate. Doubtless there is also an oblique reference to the grave scandal caused by the case of Dr. Wood, Bishop of Lichfield, which came before the Court of Arches in 1683. See below, p. 175.

The Bishop of Worcester (presumably Dr. Earle) also in 1662 asks carefully about examining the youth in the Catechism and about instructing "others that are ignorant in the fundamental points of Christian Religion ? Doth he prepare, and, as occasion is offered, present the Youth so instructed to the Bishop, to be confirmed by the laying on of his hands, with Prayer and Benediction, in that faith they profess, according to the primitive practice of the Church of Christ ?"[4] He asks also whether householders cause their children, etc., to learn the catechism, "and when they are therein well-instructed do they take care to have them brought by the Minister to Confirmation, when occasion is offered, by the Bishop, for the increase of all spiritual gifts and graces in them ?"[5] And he adds at the end of the Articles, "The Ministers of every Parish are desired to give in the Names of such as having not yet received the Lord's Supper, are by them upon examination judged fit for Confirmation, and so for the Holy Communion."[6]

Bishop Griffith, at St. Asaph in 1662, asks about catechizing and the attendance of parishioners at it, but does not mention Confirmation.[7]

Hacket at Lichfield, also in 1662, inquires about instruction in the Catechism and whether the Curate "prepares the young Men and Maidens to be confirmed by the Bishop."[1]

---

[1] *Articles of Visitation*, etc., printed at York by Alice Broade, 1662, in the possession of the present Lord Archbishop of York, Tit. ii, Art. 11 and Tit. iii, Art. 6.

[2] App. E to *Second Report of Royal Commission on Ritual* (1868), p. 601, Tit. iii, Art. 5.

[3] *Ibid*, p. 602, Tit. iv, Art. 7.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 604, Tit. iii, Art. viii.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 605, Tit. iv, Art. vi.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 606.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 607, Arts. v and xii, "Inquiries about the Parson."

Henchman, at Salisbury, 1662, asks about instruction in the Catechism, and whether the minister doth "prepare and present them, being so instructed, to be confirmed by the Bishop."[2]

Ironside, at Bristol, 1662, asks (under the heading *For Ministers*) only about catechizing and whether the parents and others send the children and servants.[3] He does not mention Confirmation.

Bishop Morley's Articles for Winchester, in 1662, are specially important because they were used by twenty-one other bishops in various dioceses up to 1683 and by six archdeacons up to 1685, so that they were used for twenty-seven other Visitations, eleven of them in this year. He asks about diligent instruction of the youth in the Catechism, and their preparation and presentation, "being so instructed, to be confirmed by the Bishop?"[4] Whether the householders cause their children, etc., to learn the Catechism, "that when they are well instructed in the same, they may be confirmed by the Bishop?"[5] Finally, at the end of the form, comes the direction, "The Ministers of every Parish are desired to give in the Names of such of the younger sort, in their several Parishes, as they judge fit to receive Confirmation from the Bishop, and to present them to be confirmed; especially such as having competently learned their Catechism, have not yet received the Holy Communion."[6] Confirmation is thus mentioned thrice.

Reynolds's Articles for Norwich, 1662, are interesting because of the previous Puritan opinions of the Bishop. He asks about admission to Holy Communion. "Doth he admit any before they have been first Catechized, and instructed in the Principles of Religion, and are able to give an account of the same, and before they have been Confirmed, and are ready and desirous to be Confirmed?" He inquires also about catechizing "that so they [the children, etc.] may be brought to understand and take upon themselves their Baptismal Covenant, and be Confirmed and admitted Communicants."[1]

---

[1] App. E, p. 609.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 611, Tit. iii, Art. 4.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 614, Art. 2.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 616, Tit. iii, Art. x.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 617, Tit. iv, Art. vii.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 618.

The Archdeacon of Essex, Layfield, in 1662, asks about catechizing "whereby the Children of the Parish may be prepared for Confirmation, according to the 90 [*sic*, 60 is meant] Canon."[2] The Archdeacon of Middlesex, Dr. Pory, in 1662, inquires yet more carefully whether the Minister does "his best endeavour to prepare children, and make them ready for Confirmation? And to that end does he catechize?" Further, does he bring or send a written list of children who know the Catechism "that by the imposition of hands and prayer they may receive strength and defence against temptation? And doth he admit any person or persons to the Holy Communion, until such time as he or they can orderly say the Catechism and be Confirmed?"[3]

But the Archdeacon of Northampton, Dr. Quarles, also in 1662, in a very short series of articles asks only about catechizing, and does not mention Confirmation.[4]

Henchman, now Bishop of London, inquires, in 1664, about catechizing the youth, and "Doth he prepare and procure them (as occasion is offered) to come and be confirmed by the Bishop?"[5] Do the householders duly send their Children, etc.? "And do they take care (when occasion is offered) they should be confirmed by the Bishop?" Further, is there any parishioner "so confirmed and instructed, and being Sixteen years of age, who refuseth to receive the Blessed Sacrament?"[6]

Bishop William Fuller, at Lincoln in 1668, inquires whether the minister does "his best endeavour to prepare Children, and make them ready for Confirmation; that so they may in their own persons renew the Promise and Vow made in their name in Baptism; solemnly ratifying and confirming the same in the presence of the Bishop ?" To that purpose does he teach the Catechism ? And doth the Minister "as often as the Bishop giveth notice for Children to be brought to him for their Confirmation either bring or send . . . the Names of all those Children whom he thinks to be fit for Confirmation ?"[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 620, "Concerning Ministers," Arts. vi and viii.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 622, "Concerning the Clergy," Art. 16.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 627, "Concerning the Celebration of Divine Service," etc., Arts. 20 and 21.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 631, Art. xiii.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 632, Tit. ii, Art. v.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 633, Tit. iii, Arts. vi and vii.

The same Bishop, in 1671, inquires even more carefully :

"Does the Minister instruct diligently in the Church Catechism, or any other, and doth he prepare and present those so instructed to be confirmed by the Bishop ?

"Does he send in the names ? (as in the Art. 19 of 1668 above).[2]

"Do the householders send their children and servants to church to learn the Catechism, that being well instructed in it they may be confirmed by the Bishop ?"[3]

And at the end follows a direction, almost identical with that of Bishop Morley at Winchester in 1662, requiring the Clergy to prepare and give in the Names of such of the younger sort whom they judge fit for Confirmation, and to present them to the Bishop to be confirmed "as there shall be opportunity."[4]

Robert Hammond, Archdeacon of Huntingdon, asks in 1670 about catechizing and whether children and servants learn their Catechism "that so they may be brought to understand and take upon them their Baptismal covenant, and be confirmed, and admitted Communicants ?"[5]

The great Bishop Pearson, at Chester in 1674, inquires concerning catechizing, and whether the Minister doth prepare and procure the youth to come and be confirmed by the Bishop ; whether the householders duly send their children, etc., to be "catechized," and whether "they take care (when occasion is offered) they should be confirmed by the Bishop ?"[6] At the end "the Ministers of every

---

[1] App. E, p. 634, Arts. 18 and 19.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 639, Tit. iii, Arts. 13 and 14.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 640, Tit. iv, Art. 7.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 642.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 637, Tit. ii, Art. 3, and Tit. iii, Art. 4.
[6] *Ibid.* p. 642, Tit. ii, Art. vi, Tit. iii, Art. vii.

Parish are desired to give in the Names of such of the younger sort, in their several parishes, as they judge fit to receive Confirmation from the Bishop."[1]

Bishop Fell at Oxford, about 1676, asks concerning catechizing and whether any parishioners "neglect the respective duties incumbent on them in reference to . . . Catechizing, Confirmation," etc. The third of the Advertisements after the Articles bids the ministers take notice "that the Bishop at his Visitation will be ready to confirm the youth that shall be fitted and brought before him: and therefore are desir'd by diligent Catechizing to prepare those under their charge, and to bring them, at the time appointed, unto the Bishop."[2]

Bishop Barlow at Lincoln in 1679 inquired in the ordinary form about catechizing, and whether the youth were prepared and procured "to come and be confirmed by the Bishop."[3] Whether the householders sent their children, and whether they take care (when occasion is offered) they should be confirmed. Further whether any one so confirmed and instructed, and being sixteen years of age, refuseth to receive the Blessed Sacrament. He adds an Advertisement which is a copy of Bishop Fell's save that to "Catechizing" he adds "in the Grounds of Religion," and proceeds, as Fell did not, "For as (*de Jure*) he cannot, so (*de Facto*) he will not Confirm any save such who have been duly Catechiz'd, and (by their Pastor's Testimony) have attain'd such a measure of Knowledge of the Principles of Christian Religion, as may render them capable of Confirmation."[4]

Bishop Peter Gunning, in the adjoining diocese of Ely, also in 1679, issues by far the most thorough and interesting Articles on this, as on other, subjects. He asked about catechizing (and instructing also) and proceeded, "Doth he by this and all other good means and admonitions, prepare and procure them (as occasion is offered) devoutly to come and seek to be confirmed by the Bishop, and himself either send or bring " the names of the candidates " humbly to seek and ask that benefit of Confirmation ? "[1] And he inquired, "Are there . . . any Persons that being unconfirmed are not instructed in their Catechism, or not Religiously brought up, or not brought to Confirmation, or being of years, neglect themselves to seek it upon pretence of elder age, or of having received the Communion, or Orders,[2] or upon any other pretence whatsoever ? "[3]

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 643.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 644, Tit. iii, Art. 4 (misprinted "3"), Tit. iv, Art. 2.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 645, Tit. ii, Art. v.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 646, Tit. iii, Arts. vi and vii.

John Feilding, Archdeacon of Dorset, in 1683, inquired about catechizing, but did not mention Confirmation.[4]

Last of all in this series comes the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Sancroft, visiting as Metropolitan at Lincoln in 1686, and using Articles which he had used for his own diocese in 1682. He inquires with care about catechizing. Instead of an afternoon sermon, does the minister explain some part of the Church Catechism, or preach upon a text which shall lead up to it, or to an explanation of the *Liturgy* and Prayers ? Does he instruct the youth in the Catechism ? " And being thus prepared, and of convenient age, doth he take care to present them to the Bishop to be confirmed ? " Do all the householders cause their children and servants to learn the Catechism " that when they are well-instructed in the same, they may be confirmed by the Bishop ? "[5]

Finally, in 1688, in the Articles recommended by the Archbishop to all the Bishops within his Province, on July 26, when affairs were critical, of twelve things to be urged upon the Clergy and People the Primate puts fourth : " That they (the Clergy) diligently *Catechize* the Children and Youth of their *Parishes* (as the *Rubrick* of the *Common-Prayer Book* and the 59th Canon injoyn) and so prepare them to be brought in due time to Confirmation, when there shall be Opportunity."[6]

---

[1] App. E, p. 648, " Concerning the Clergy," Art. 13.

[2] This question was a far-reaching one. In 1769 the last Bishop of the regular succession of the Nonjurors, Bishop Gordon, received Confirmation from Bishop Robert Forbes, in Scotland, though he had been a regularly consecrated Bishop twenty-eight years. See below, p. 208.

[3] App. E, p. 649, " Concerning the Parishioners," Art. 3.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 652, " of Ministers," Art. 4.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 655, Tit. iii, Arts. 11 and 12, Tit. iv, Art. 6.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 657.

This long series of Visitation inquiries and Advertisements shows at least that the importance of Confirmation was insisted upon by the bishops in administering their dioceses as emphatically as it was by the rubrics of the Prayer Book and by the Canons; the theology which lies behind it is, save in some few cases, the theology of Hooker and of Jeremy Taylor. But the inclusion of a certain number of the moderate Puritans in the Church meant that the Prayer Book rubrics and statements about Confirmation, its origin, necessity and blessings, were to be reduced, if possible, to a lower key, and though this group was not, until 1688, very powerful yet the Calvinist leaven was still working. The most scandalous instance of neglect of and disbelief in Confirmation by a bishop of the time was afforded by the case of Thomas Wood, Bishop of Lichfield from 1671 to his death in 1692. Wood was a Puritan, but a bad one, and as Dean of Lichfield had been excommunicated by Bishop Hacket in 1667. After his consecration he grossly neglected his duties until at last, in December 1683, he was cited by Archbishop Sancroft into the Court of Arches. Five articles were alleged against him, the third being "That he hath not confirmed the young persons within his diocese capable to be confirmed, and hath not any public or private Ordination of Deacons or Priests."[1] Bishop Wood was, in the result, suspended and fined.

Evidence for the practice of Confirmation at the end of this period exists in the printed fragment of the *Diary*[2] *of Dr. Thomas Cartwright*, Bishop of Chester, which covers the first year of his episcopate. Consecrated on October 17, 1686, the Bishop proceeded to his diocese and on his way on November 14 at Richmond "after dinner" he confirmed "Sir Marmaduke Wyvil and about 300 more."[3] On December 19 he held his first ordination, at Chester, ordaining 12 deacons and 8 priests, and records that on the day before, after evening prayers in his chapel, he "confirmed three to be made deacons."[4] Two days later, on December

---

[1] *The Chesters of Chicheley*, by R. E. C. Waters (1878), ii. 497, where the Articles against the Bishop are printed from the Tanner MSS. in the Bodleian (no. 104, fol. 75).

[2] Camden Society, 1843, no. xxii.

[3] *Op. cit.* p. 12.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 19.

21 in the cathedral, the Bishop "confirmed about 200,"[1] and again on the following January 1, before dinner, he confirmed about 250 persons."[2] On January 23 at Tarwin, the Bishop notes that he preached "and confirmed about 90 persons;"[3] two days later, at Whitegate church, he confirmed "about 300 persons."[4] This shows a considerable measure of episcopal activity, for none of these confirmations were on visitation, and in little over his first two months in his diocese Bishop Cartwright had confirmed some 1,250 candidates. His second ordination on February 20, 1686/7, when 7 deacons and 3 priests were ordained, produced no candidates for confirmation; not so his ordination on September 25, 1687, at which he ordained 9 deacons and 7 priests, and records that he confirmed in his chapel four of those to be made deacons, and gives their names.[5] It is possible thus to see the type of man who had failed to be confirmed; one was aged 23, an M.A. of Wadham College, Oxford, another was 27, an M.A. of Edinburgh, the third was 24, a B.A. of Christ Church, and the fourth a man of 23, a B.A. of Jesus College, Cambridge. It may be presumed, fairly, that Bishop Cartwright was only doing what was usually done by the bishops of the time, and that before ordaining they were careful to see that candidates had been confirmed. One other entry of a confirmation in this year is noteworthy: on August 14, when Bishop Cartwright was in the most Roman Catholic part of his diocese, at Lancaster. The Bishop notes: "I preached and confirmed 500 in the afternoon, most of them aged people, God be praised."[6]

PERIOD 6, 1688-1850. FROM THE REVOLUTION TO 1850

The Revolution of 1688 was not without its effect on the doctrine and the practice of Confirmation. The new King, William III, was a Dutch Calvinist, and neither confirmed, nor, apparently, ready and desirous to be confirmed. Nevertheless, he was admitted to Holy Communion; as were George I and George II in the next century, though they were not Calvinists but Lutherans. All three kings were men of frankly immoral life, yet they were, necessarily, brought at times into close contact with the Church and its rulers; and bishops who condoned the lack of Confirmation in the King could hardly, with propriety, insist upon the Prayer Book standard being observed rigorously in their dioceses. Further, until the Protestant Succession was firmly established, the "Dissenting Interest" was politically important, and after 1688 care was taken to appoint, for the most part, Whigs and "Low Churchmen" (the term came into use in 1698) who were anxious to minimize the differences between the Church and the Calvinist systems.

---

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 21.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 22.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 27.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 28.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 81.
[6] *Ibid.* p. 72.

Another cause which depreciated Confirmation was the resolute refusal of the Whig politicians to allow bishops to be consecrated for the American Colonies, which, by an absurd fiction, were regarded as within the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London (though no bishop of that see ever visited them). The pathetic appeals from chaplains and others for bishops to confirm in the American colonies were entirely ignored, and colonists who desired confirmation or ordination had to take the long sea-voyage to England, on which some of them perished. Nor could the slaves on the plantations, when converted and baptized, be confirmed. Nevertheless, it is not quite true to say that "for one hundred years no one in the Episcopal Church, in this country (the United States), was confirmed because we had no bishops,"[1] because in 1722 the Nonjuror Bishop Ralph Taylor consecrated two priests, Dr. Welton and John Talbot, as bishops for America. Both certainly functioned as bishops, Welton till 1726, when he was recalled, Talbot till his death in 1727.[2] Not all these causes operated immediately upon the Revolution, and some worked more slowly and less powerfully than others; but all had an effect.

---

[1] Dr. Ethelbert Talbot, Bishop of Bethlehem, U.S.A., in *The Problem of Christian Unity* (Macmillan Co.), 1921, p. 116. The Bishop is arguing that Confirmation is not necessary.

[2] See Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors* (1924), pp. 88-91, with references there.

One of them, the desire to "comprehend," if not all the dissenting bodies, at any rate the Presbyterians, was at work in the reign of Charles II. In the second comprehension scheme, suggested in February 1667/8, it was proposed to omit in the prayer after Confirmation in the Prayer Book the clause "after the example of Thy holy Apostles, and to certify them by this sign," etc.[1] These attempts came to nothing at the time, but they were revived in 1688, and a Commission was appointed to prepare a comprehension scheme in 1689. Of its 598 proposed alterations in the Prayer Book six touched Confirmation—a long exhortation was to be read on the Lord's Day preceding, the *Preface* to the Office was turned into an address to the candidates, the ancient prayer for the sevenfold gift was altered, a third prayer added before the blessing, and there was an exhortation to the confirmed. The concluding rubric directed that "none shall be admitted to Confirmation but such as shall be judged fit to receive the Communion upon the next occasion."[2] These and the other proposed changes were never submitted to the Church, for it was evident that they would be rejected. The reform which was asked for (by one of the Puritan school) was "Confirmations . . . in less haste than what is too customary, and with greater solemnity."[3]

The period from the Revolution to the year 1850 saw produced no great treatise on Confirmation comparable with that of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, but the subject was not neglected. In 1701 Samuel Saywell, B.D., Rector of Bluntisham, and a former Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, published *The Divine Original of Confirmation.*[4] Like Canfield's book before it, it is an expanded Visitation Sermon, and is dedicated to the preacher's "Most Honoured

---

[1] Thorndike, *Works*, Anglo-Cath. Lib., v. 305. This volume contains a valuable account of the schemes of comprehension put out in Charles II's reign, pp. 301-308.

[2] Procter and Frere, *New History of B. of C. P.*, pp. 216, 217. The full text of the proposed changes was first published in Parliamentary Blue Book, in 1854.

[3] Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 454 (Art. xii of Letter to Tillotson).

[4] Press mark in B. Mus., 4326 a. a. 67.

Diocesan, James, Lord Bishop of Lincoln."[1] The writer's remedy for the disorders of the times is "to bring the tractable and best disposed people of the Church of England to a more regular and stedfast conformity to the Rules and Constitutions of their own Church," and he observes that "'Tis certain many People have very false and odd notions of 'Confirmation,' and esteem it not at all, others look on it as but a Man's Blessing at most, and therefore great numbers never seek it, either for themselves or for their Children. Others do it in a formal manner."[2] Saywell deals with the Anglican authorities, viz. the rubrics of the Prayer Book and Canons 60 and 61; for scriptural authority he relies on the usual passages, Acts viii. 14-17, etc. He thinks a possible instance of Confirmation is to be found in Acts xvi. 21, 22. For the theology of the subject he considers that "even Baptismal Grace itself often dwindleth away . . . merely for want of adding duly the further strengthening gift of Confirmation to it; and both these gifts are lost for not frequently renewing . . . and increasing of them by the fresh supplies of the Spirit, which are offer'd us in the Lord's Supper."[3]

He teaches that in Confirmation is another gift of the Holy Spirit, witnessed to in the Old Testament by the symbol of oil, that this gift is only for believers and baptized persons, and that it hath ever been the custom and practice of the Church to reserve this office to be performed by the Bishop only, the variations being inconsiderable. He insists further, echoing rather faintly Thorndike's point, that at their Confirmation "Christians do, as it were, put themselves under the care and charge of their Bishop, and own him for their Chief and Common Spiritual Father in Christ." As for the lack of chrism, "we are sure they [the Reformers] lost no essential part of this Ordinance" by parting with it. He touches on the relation of Confirmation to Baptism; Confirmation gives strength, Christian courage and fortitude, while the grace given in Baptism is that of life.[4]

---

[1] Dr. James Gardiner, a Whig, but a diligent and conscientious prelate.

[2] *The Divine Original*, etc., p. a. 3.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 2.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 16–18.

Saywell fortifies his positions with considerable patristic learning, quoting the usual passages from Theophilus of Antioch, Tertullian (thrice) and St. Cyprian (thrice), St. Cyril of Jerusalem (thrice), St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and the homily ascribed to Eusebius Emisenus. He adds an Appendix with some Rules of Devotion,[1] and he urges the elder candidates to "add some Fasting to their Prayers."

In 1706 Robert Nelson published his *Great Duty of Frequenting the Christian Sacrifice, etc., to which is prefixed Instructions for Confirmation.*[2] The Instructions cover only 22 of the 202 pages, and are in the form of Question and Answer; notwithstanding this drawback in form they are excellently adapted to their purpose, and are models of clearness. Thus to the question "What is Confirmation?" the answer is, "A solemn Rite instituted by the Apostles, wherein the Bishop, by laying on of Hands, and by fervent Prayer, and authoritative Benediction, conveys to such Persons who in the Presence of God and the Congregation sincerely renew their Baptismal Vow, a further Degree of God's Grace and Holy Spirit." The "End and Design" of it is declared to be, "that Baptized Christians should by their own deliberate choice take upon them the Vow and Promise made at Baptism." As to the age for Confirmation he answers, "The Church of England hath not determined any certain age, but requires it to be done to such as are come to a competent Age," which implies, he continues, that they shall understand the nature of the Vow and be able to make a firm resolution of keeping it. He finds a likeness to Confirmation in Jewish boys being declared *Sons of the Precept* at 13. Nelson grounds Confirmation on the New Testament passages in Acts viii and xix and Heb. vi, pointing out that the last led Calvin himself to admit that Confirmation was instituted by the Apostles. For patristic authority he quotes St. Cyprian, Tertullian, and St. Jerome. The effects of Confirmation are, he teaches, secret and invisible gifts of the Holy Spirit.

In 1699 Samuel Clarke (1675-1729), the distinguished metaphysician and Latitudinarian divine, then chaplain to Bishop Moore of Norwich, published the work which his friend William Whiston considered the most serious of his treatises, *Three Practical Essays on Baptism, Confirmation and Repentance*.[1] His object is, he says in his Preface, to show that at Baptism God *always* bestows that grace which is necessary to enable men to perform their duty, and that to those who are baptized in their infancy, this grace is sealed and assured at Confirmation.

---

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 46 *seq.*

[2] The copy I have used is the 10th edition (London, 1734).

The essay "Of Confirmation" is by far the longest of the three; of the 254 pages of the book it occupies 178. Clarke grounds Confirmation on Acts viii. 17 and Heb. vi. 2, and on the usual passages in St. Cyprian and Tertullian.

In the case of those baptized as infants, Clarke regards their Confirmation as a solemn taking their baptismal vow upon themselves; by the imposition of hands the great privileges of Baptism should be sealed anew and secured to them.[2] He wishes "that no one should be admitted to the Communion before he were confirmed," [3] and that no one should be confirmed without careful preparation and instruction. If Confirmation were rightly and solemnly performed the candidates would understand and be convinced that they now receive the assistance of the Holy Spirit.[4]

Much of the treatise is concerned with preparation for the rite, the necessity of a clear belief in the truths, first of natural and then of revealed religion. As to what is done at Confirmation, Clarke puts first the ratification of the baptismal vow: "By the Imposition of Hands we have sealed and confirmed to us all the Privileges which the condition of the same Baptismal Covenant entitles us to receive." [5] But the candidate is urged, later, to come "with a pure Heart and a Mind prepared for the reception of the Holy Ghost, and God will not fail to pour down upon you the abundance of His Grace, to give you the strength from thenceforward to overcome," etc., and he insists that all temptations can be conquered through the grace given in this ordinance.[6] In the twelfth chapter of the essay, Clarke, summing up a very practical exhortation to perseverance, urges the confirmed to remember " that they are by Baptism dedicated to the Service of God; that they are by Confirmation assured of the Assistance of the Holy Spirit, and that their Bodies are the *Temples of the Holy Ghost*."[1] Clarke's doctrine was somewhat remarkable, considering its source, for Hoadly, who was Clarke's contemporary at Cambridge, declared that he wished to be known to posterity as " the friend of Dr. Clarke."[2]

---

[1] I have used the third edition (London, 1710).

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 46.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 47.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 48.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 147.

[6] *Ibid.* ch. vii, p. 150 *seq.*

During the reign of Queen Anne, 1702-1714, the Whig influence, though it remained strong, did not prevent the appointment to bishoprics of George Bull (1634-1710) and William Beveridge (1637-1708), both of them great scholars and both opposed to the Latitudinarian opinions. Beveridge, who had been Archdeacon of Colchester since 1681, and had refused to succeed Ken at Bath and Wells in 1691, was consecrated to St. Asaph in 1704. He gives a short and complete statement of the Church's teaching about Confirmation in a sermon on *Christ's Presence with His Ministers*.[3] Having quoted Acts viii and xix, he says: " Hence the Catholic Church, in all ages, hath not only retained this Apostolical rite, which we now call *Confirmation*, but hath always esteemed it an essential part of the Apostolical office, and therefore to be performed by none but by the Apostles themselves and their successors to the end of the world. And therefore it was the ancient and constant custom of the Primitive Church, as it is ours, for the Bishop of every diocese to go into the lesser cities and villages belonging to him, and there lay his hands upon those who were baptized by Priests or Deacons, that they might receive the Holy Ghost," and he quotes St. Jerome, *adv. Lucifer*. " How any Bishops," he adds, " in our days dare neglect so considerable a part of their office, I know not; but fear they will have no good account to give of it when they come to stand before our Lord's tribunal." As for those who " refuse or neglect Confirmation, when they may have it administered to them," they have just cause to suspect that they have no good sense of religion, nor regard for the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit." Beveridge's teaching was remarkably contradicted by his Latitudinarian successor, Fleetwood, as will appear.

---

[1] Clarke, *op. cit.* p. 211.

[2] *Life of Clarke*, quoted by Sir L. Stephen in his article on Clarke in the *D.N.B.* iv. 445.

[3] *Works*, Anglo-Cath. Lib., i. 12, 13.

George Bull was consecrated to the see of St. David's in 1705, and like Beveridge was near the end of his life when he became a bishop. It was "a matter of great grief" to him that by his failing health "he was prevented from travelling over his diocese, in order to administer in all parts of it that holy apostolical rite grounded upon Scripture as expounded by Catholic tradition . . . known . . . in the Church by the name of *Confirmation*."[2] Nelson proceeds to state the primitive names of the rite and its benefits, and continues: "But though he was thus hindered from administering this holy rite of Confirmation throughout his large diocese, yet where he resided, and in the neighbourhood of such places, he was not wanting in affording opportunities of receiving it, to all such as were disposed to embrace them; and therefore he confirmed at Brecknock, Caermarthen, Landeilo, Abermarless, as often as there was occasion."[3] This was an advance upon the practice which confined Confirmation to the Bishop's Visitation.

The most prominent Bishop of the Revolution was Dr. Gilbert Burnet (1643-1715), who held the see of Salisbury from 1689 till his death. In 1692 he published *A Discourse of the Pastoral Care*, which exhibits his high standard of pastoral duty for bishops as well as for priests and deacons. Confirmation, however, is not mentioned under a bishop's duties, though it is referred to under the priest's duty of catechizing. With catechizing "a minister is to join the preparing those whom he instructs to be confirmed."[4] Burnet's view of the purpose of Confirmation

---

[1] Bishop A. C. A. Hall, of Vermont, quoting part of this passage in his *Confirmation*, says Beveridge "may be regarded as a typical Anglican divine" (p. 46).

[2] *Life of Dr. George Bull*, by Robert Nelson. Prefixed to Bull's *Works* (ed. Burton, 1827), i. 360.

[3] *Op. cit.* p. 361.

[4] Bishop Burnet, *Of the Pastoral Care*, reprinted in *The Clergyman's Instructor* (5th ed. Oxford, 1843), p. 194.

is that "it is their renewing their baptismal vow in their own persons which the Church designs by that Office; and the bearing in their own minds a sense of their being bound immediately by that, which their sureties then undertook for them." The Bishop is silent about any gift of the Holy Spirit. He is concerned that candidates "must stay till they themselves understand what they do," and therefore "till one is of an age and disposition fit to receive the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper," and he criticizes adversely the prevailing practice of his day. "In the common management of that holy rite, it is but too visible, that of those multitudes that crowd to it, the far greater part come merely as if they were to receive the bishop's blessing, without any sense of the vow made by them, and of their renewing their baptismal engagements in it." Bishop Burnet, it should be noted, was active in administering Confirmation and "in twenty years had confirmed in 265 churches in the diocese."[1]

The subjective side of Confirmation, to the exclusion, apparently, of any other, is developed most clearly in the very interesting and original Visitation Articles issued by Dr. Fleetwood, who succeeded Bishop Beveridge at St. Asaph in 1708. Fleetwood was by birth, training, and conviction a pronounced Whig (he was the cousin of a regicide), and he was also both attractive and cultivated, a genuine antiquary, a good preacher, and a sincerely religious man. Queen Anne is said to have called him "my bishop," and "to have favoured him till her death."[2]

Fleetwood held his primary Visitation in 1710 in a wholly new fashion, printing what he would have said in his Charge in sections beneath the various Articles of Inquiry. The effect is admirable, and the Bishop's remarks on pastoral care, reading, and the like, are full of good sense, practical, frank, and sometimes extremely entertaining, though they leave a general impression of being lectures on Pastoral Theology delivered by a benevolent layman with a considerable leaning towards the Church of England. Fleetwood states that his Inquiries are "generally the same with those of my Honoured Predecessor, Dr. Beveridge" (to whose memory he pays a warm tribute), "excepting that some new Occurrences have occasioned some few Additions and some little Alterations."[1] The "new occurrences" were, presumably, the Tory reaction which began in 1709 and the consequent fear that "the Protestant Succession" was in danger. The Bishop inquires about catechizing, and commends the practice both for children and servants,[2] partly upon the ground that "'tis for the Public Good, as well as for their own; the whole *Parish* is the better for dutiful Children and honest Servants."[3] The Bishop next inquires whether there are any unbaptized, and baptized and instructed in the Catechism "and yet have not been Confirmed by the Bishop," or any confirmed and above 16 who are not communicants.[4]

---

[1] *Dict. of English Church History*, p. 75, *s.v.* Burnet, Gilbert.

[2] *D.N.B.* vol. vii, *s.v.* Fleetwood, William.

Under these articles the Bishop says that "if there be any unbaptized they ought to be discovered, duly instructed," and then christened. "After this, when they come to Years of Understanding, they are to be *Confirmed* by the Bishop." As to what "the Years of Understanding" mean, the Bishop says, very wisely, that a child's "understanding is not to be measured by his Years, nor by his Memory, but by his sense of things and apprehension," for, he explains, "the Business of *Confirmation*, on the Children's part, is the renewing and confirming with their own Mouth" the Baptismal Vow. "I should therefore be glad that none were brought to *Confirmation* but such as may be well supposed to have some Sense and Understanding of what they undertake, and not be able barely to answer to the Questions of the *Catechism*." But, the Bishop adds, very carefully, that "I hope that no Body will think himself not bound to perform his Baptismal Vows, because he has not solemnly undertaken to do so, by being *confirm'd*. Whether People are confirm'd or no, they are under the same Obligations to perform those Vows." He continues: "*Confirmation* is by no means necessary or *essential* to Baptism; nor *completive* of it.

---

[1] Appendix E to *Second Report, Royal Commission on Ritual* (1868), p. 663.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 666, Tit. i, Art. 7.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 670, Tit. ii, Art. 3.

[4] *Ibid.* Tit. ii, Arts. 4, 5, and 6.

'Tis an excellent Institution of the Church, and serves to very good purposes, but it is no *Sacrament*; and therefore those who have not slighted and neglected it, but wanted it, either through Ignorance, or lack of Opportunity, need not be much concern'd, altho' they have receiv'd the *Lord's Supper*, without being *Confirm'd*. It is sufficient (in the want of Opportunity) that Men be ready for it, and desirous of it, where and when it may be had. And for such as have received the Lord's Supper without it, they are presumed to have done already all that *Confirmation* supposes they should do, and therefore are not proper Subjects of it. Such therefore as have received the Lord's Supper, should not come to *Confirmations*. But when things go Regularly, the Children that have been Baptiz'd" are to be catechized and instructed, confirmed, and after that "to receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The Church supposes them capable of this, at 16 years of age; some are so, before, and others not, even Years after that Age."[1] The Bishop makes no allusion to any gift given and received in Confirmation. Whatever may be thought of his teaching on the object and result of Confirmation, it is interesting to observe how the directions of Canons 60 and 61 and the Prayer Book rubric, "none shall be admitted to the Holy Communion, etc.," could, by mere process of administration, be bent to serve the case of the Puritans who objected to Confirmation. Doubless the Occasional Conformists, *i.e.* those Nonconformists who, to qualify for office, had to receive Holy Communion (by the Test Act of 1673) were in the Bishop's mind, as well as those church people "in the Plantations" in America, to whom the Whigs steadfastly refused Bishops. Bishop Fleetwood's directions, which directly traverse those of Bishop Gunning at Ely in 1679, are the only instance I have found of such teaching issued officially; though doubtless they represent the practice of the "Low Church," throughout the eighteenth century, and even later.

A better known Bishop of Dr. Fleetwood's school was Benjamin Hoadly (1676-1761), consecrated to the see of Bangor in 1716, and translated in turn to Hereford, Salisbury, and Winchester, which last see he held for twenty-six years. As bishop, Hoadly never visited his diocese of Bangor, nor, apparently, Hereford.[1] In 1716 he published his *Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Non-jurors*, which was, in fact, a rationalistic attack upon sacramental doctrine; the author asserted that "to expect the grace of God, from any hands but His own, is to affront Him."[2] This was, like another passage in the book, recognized as an attack upon Confirmation, and it was answered by William Law (to whom Hoadly never ventured to reply) in his famous *Letters to the Bishop of Bangor*. In his second Letter, published in 1717, Law treated of Confirmation: "There is an institution, my Lord, in the yet Established Church of England, which we call Confirmation: it is founded upon the express words of Scripture, primitive observance, and the universal practice of all succeeding ages in the Church. The design of this institution is that it should be a means of conferring grace, by the prayer and imposition of bishop's hands, on those who have been already baptized. But yet against all this authority, both divine and human, and the express order of our own Church, your Lordship teaches the laity 'that all human benedictions are useless niceties; and that to expect God's grace from any hands but His own, is to affront Him.'"[3] Law then quotes Acts viii. 14 and urges, after his inimitable manner, (1) that even in the apostolical times, something else besides Baptism was necessary to qualify persons to become complete members of the Body of Christ; (2) that God's graces are not only conferred by human hands, but by some particular hands; (3) that this office was so restricted to the chief governors of the Church that it could not be given by those of an inferior order, even though inspired—as Philip the Deacon; (4) that this power of the Apostles was entirely owing to their superior degree in the ministry, not to any extraordinary gifts (for Philip was himself a worker of miracles). Then he describes how if any of "your Lordship's well-instructed laity" had been alive at that day, "they must have said 'Why do you, Peter, or John, pretend to this blasphemous power? Whilst we believe the Gospel, we cannot expect the grace of God from any hands but His own. You give us the Holy Ghost! You confer the grace of God!'" Law proceeds to quote Bishop Beveridge's "remarkable words upon Confirmation" cited above,[1] and inquires how Bishop Hoadly dares perform this part of his office. He continues, "if therefore any baptized persons should come to your Lordship for Confirmation . . . . your Lordship ought, I humbly conceive, to make them this declaration: 'My friends, for the sake of decency and order, I have taken upon me the episcopal character; and according to custom, which has long prevailed against common sense, am now to lay my hands upon you; but, I beseech you, as you have any regard for the truth of the Gospel or to the honour of God, not to imagine there is anything in this action, more than a useless, empty ceremony: for if you expect to have any spiritual advantages from human benedictions, or to receive grace from the imposition of a bishop's hands, you affront God, and in effect, renounce Christianity.'"

---

[1] Appendix E, p. 670.

---

[1] *D.N.B.* vol. ix, *s.v.* Hoadly, Benjamin.

[2] Hoadly, *Preservative*, p. 89 (*Works*, ed. 1776, i. 592). The references are those in Nash and Gore's edition of William Law's *Defence of Church Principles*, p. 80.

[3] Law, *Defence of Church Principles*, ed. Nash and Gore (n.d.), p. 81.

Law goes on to quote Heb. vi. 2 and St. Cyprian, *Ep.* lxxiii, and sums up his argument in a trenchant paragraph.[2] But Hoadly's views, and not Law's, were to the taste of the Government, and the bishoprics were, for the most part, filled by Whig partisans.

One monograph on Confirmation was written by a divine of another type, Dr. Thomas Secker, who, in 1735, was consecrated to the See of Bristol, from which he was translated in 1737 to Oxford, and finally, in 1758, to Canterbury. Secker, from 1733 until 1750, was Rector of St. James's, Piccadilly, holding the benefice with his bishoprics, and was a good parish priest. He was diligent in confirming; as soon as he was appointed to Bristol he set about the visitation of his diocese, and "confirmed in a great number of places,"[3] and at St. James's, Piccadilly, "held a Confirmation once every year, and examined and instructed the candidates several weeks before in the vestry, and gave them religious tracts."[1] His lecture on Confirmation is addressed to the candidates, and was delivered, evidently, at the beginning of confirmation services.[2] Its text is Acts viii. 17, *Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost*, and the Bishop explains that "from this and like instances of the practice of the Apostles, is derived, what bishops, their successors . . . have practised ever since, and which we now call Confirmation."[3] He explains, further, that preaching and Baptism were permitted to all ranks of ministers, but "it was reserved to the highest, by prayer and laying on of hands, to communicate further measures of the Holy Ghost."[4] The Bishop then bids the candidates turn to their Prayer Books and follow, while he explains the Confirmation service, which he proceeds to do. Speaking of the phrase "years of discretion" he insists, like others before him, that "being able to say the words of the Catechism is by no means enough," but there must be understanding and a serious resolution, and he says: "I hope and beg, that neither ministers nor parents will be too eager for bringing children very early to Confirmation; but first teach them carefully."[5]

---

[1] *Supra*, p. 182.

[2] Law, *op. cit.* pp. 84, 85.

[3] *Life*, by Porteus, prefixed to Secker's *Works* (ed. 1811), i. pp. xi, xii.

"But as there are some too young for Confirmation, some also may be thought too old: especially if they have received the Holy Sacrament without it." Here the Bishop is on delicate ground, for on one side was the Whig tradition as voiced by Fleetwood, on the other the clear teaching of the Fathers expressed in the rubric of the Book of Common Prayer. Secker treads carefully but surely. "Now there are not indeed all the same reasons for the confirmation of such as of others: nor hath the Church, I believe, determined any thing about their case, as it might be thought unlikely to happen. But still, since it doth happen too frequently, that persons were not able, or have neglected, to apply for this purpose; so whenever they apply, as by doing it they express a desire to *fulfill all righteousness*;

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. xii.
[2] It is printed in his *Works* (ed. 1811), vi. 399-416.
[3] *Ibid.* pp. 399, 400.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 400.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 401.

and may certainly receive benefit, both from the profession and the prayers, appointed in the office; my judgement is, that they should not be rejected, but encouraged."[1]

The Bishop, having explained that Confirmation can no more be repeated than can Baptism, deals very earnestly with the candidates' response to the Bishop's question, "When," as he says, "you pronounce the awful words, *I do*,"[2] and then teaches that "this appointment is called Confirmation" because the baptized, having confirmed their vows, prayers are offered "that God would confirm and strengthen them in their good purpose."[3] He points out that the prayer for the sevenfold Gift "was used in the office of Confirmation fourteen hundred years ago, if not sooner,"[4] and makes it clear that his custom was to confirm candidates either singly or in pairs.[5] He holds that the laying on of hands was reckoned in the Epistle to the Hebrews among the *foundations* of the Christian profession (he refers to Heb. vi). The Bishop is very anxious to guard himself: Confirmation is not "popish," for "the Papists administer Confirmation by other ceremonies of their own devising, and have laid aside this primitive one, which therefore our Church very prudently restored." He adds that Luther and Calvin "and several of their followers" approved it as apostolical, though he adds, very candidly, that "they rashly abolished it, as having been abused." (The Bishop here is slightly confused, for it is not clear, in his view, who abused it, since the Papists are said to have laid it aside.) However, he adds: "But I am credibly informed that at Geneva it hath lately been restored."[6] He is almost nervously anxious that the laying on of hands should not be thought to have too great an importance; candidates are not to think that bishops have or claim power "to confer blessings arbitrarily on whom they please; but only as petitioning God for that blessing from above which He alone can give"—and here is a distant echo of the fashionable teaching of Bishop Hoadly—nor must the candidates expect "any sudden and sensible change" in their hearts. But they may reasonably promise themselves "greater measures, when real occasion requires them, of such divine assistance as will be needful for" their "support and orderly growth in every virtue of a Christian life." The Bishop comments shortly on the final prayers, and concludes with very practical teaching about perseverance and Holy Communion. The discourse differs from Hooker, Hammond, Bishops Hall and Jeremy Taylor, Samuel Clarke and William Law, in having no single patristic reference; but, for all that, it is a clear return to their teaching and in marked contrast with the view of Bishops Burnet and Fleetwood, who are completely silent about any gift of the Holy Spirit in Confirmation.[1]

---

[1] Secker, *Works*, vi. 402.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 407.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 408.
[4] Secker, *Ibid.* p. 411.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 412.
[6] *Ibid.* p. 413.

Another Anglican bishop of the eighteenth century was, geographically at any rate, far apart from his brethren: the saintly Thomas Wilson (1663-1755), who held the see of Sodor and Man from 1698 till his death. He was not unknown. He refused the see of Exeter in 1724, and George II specially asked his prayers.

The teaching and practice of Bishop Wilson on Confirmation are abundantly clear. "The great end of Confirmation," he held, "is to prepare young christians for the sacrament of the Lord's Supper."[2] It is impossible to carry out the baptismal vows without the help of the Holy Spirit. "And for this very reason, the apostles of Christ (no doubt by His appointment) began this usage in the Church of God, that after persons had by baptism been received into the Church . . . the apostles, and their successors, should lay their hands upon them. . . . Now, if this be the way by which God will bestow a greater measure of His Holy Spirit, what sober person will neglect such means of grace? Who will dare to despise this ordinance?"[3] Further, the Bishop and his Clergy in Synod agreed, and it was "soon after past into a Law," that "all persons intending to Marry, should first (if they have not already done it) fit themselves for Confirmation and the Lord's

---

[1] Secker was indeed no follower of Hoadly, and spoke in later life of "Christianity *secundum usum Winton.*" when Hoadly still held that see. He was, moreover, the close friend of Bishop Butler.

[2] *Works,* Anglo-Cath. Libr., ii. 107.

[3] *Op. cit.* iii. 365.

Supper."[1] For this end the Bishop wrote a Catechism, translated into Manx, in preparation for Confirmation, which insists very clearly on the personal confession of Christian faith.

The Bishop in his own copy made notes, apparently for addresses, such as "The effect of this ordinance is to convey the graces of God's Holy Spirit."[2] In his *Sacra Privata*, under the section devoted to Confirmation, Bishop Wilson made many notes to the same effect, thus: "Confirmation is the perfection of Baptism. The Holy Ghost descends invisibly upon such as are rightly prepared to receive such a blessing, as at the first He came visibly upon those that had been baptized,"[3] and he adds prayers for his own use before and after confirming; he is "sure Confirmation had (its origin) from Christ."[4] He notes Calvin's two passages on the subject, as well as the references from Beza, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, St. Jerome, and Bishop Beveridge, and puts down also what appear to be short Confirmation addresses. He records the number of candidates he confirmed each year from 1737 to 1746 inclusive, 2,766 in all.[5] Bishop Wilson is also very insistent on the need of a true conversion. "If the Confirmation of the Heart does not precede that of the laying of the Hands, or Confirmation of the Bishop, the person confirm'd has no reason to expect the Graces of God's Spirit thereby conferred."[6] In his *Parochialia*, issued as a Lenten Pastoral in 1708, the Bishop deals first with Confirmation and gives suggestions for instruction of candidates daily during a month, with prayers to be used daily by the instructor.[7] The teaching is crystal clear, the Christian scheme of redemption is set forth very simply: the Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection, Ascension, the Coming of the Holy Ghost "with mighty power to set up His kingdom, which is His Church, among men . . . to free mankind from the . . . slavery of sin. In order to this, the Holy Ghost appointed certain persons (who are called Christ's ministers) and gave them power," etc. Then follow Baptism and the solemn renewal of the vows at Confirmation, for which purpose "Jesus Christ hath sent down His Holy Spirit to be communicated *by the laying on of hands*, to all such as are disposed to receive Him."[1] The Bishop insists very strongly, as will be perceived, upon the personal and subjective side of Confirmation; but he also emphasizes as strongly the objective side, the gift of the Holy Spirit by the laying on of the bishop's hands. Six of his printed sermons[2] were preached at Confirmations. Bishop Wilson, it will be noticed, was a contemporary on the Bench with Bishops Burnet, Fleetwood, and Hoadly, as well as with Bishops Beveridge, Bull, and Archbishop Secker.

---

[1] *Op. cit.* iv. p. iii.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 1-5.

[3] *Op. cit.* v. 76.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 79.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 83.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 326.

[7] *Op. cit.* vii. 8-19.

One most learned divine of the century cannot be overlooked. In 1722 Charles Wheatley (1686-1742), Vicar of Brent and Furneux Pelham, in Hertfordshire, and formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, published the fullest edition of his *Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer*, in which he embodied the researches of Bishop Sparrow, L'Estrange, Dr. Comber, and Dr. Nichols. He dealt very fully with Confirmation. Following Optatus, St. Cyril, and St. Chrysostom, like Jeremy Taylor, he traces it to the descent of the Holy Spirit upon our Lord after His Baptism.[3]

For its apostolic practice he quotes Acts viii and xix, the latter showing "that the receiving of the Holy Ghost was not the consequence of their being baptized, but of the Apostle's laying on his hands."[4] He quotes 2 Cor. i. 21, 22, Eph. i. 13 and iv. 30, as showing that St. Paul "supposes both the Corinthians and Ephesians to have been all partakers of this holy rite," and Heb. vi. 2, which is, "even in Calvin's opinion, abundantly sufficient to prove Confirmation to be of *apostolical* institution," though Wheatley thinks it "of a higher derivation." For its practice by the Church in all ages, he cites nearly twenty patristic references (in a single footnote) and for its benefits he holds that "till we receive the rite of Confirmation, we are but *babes in Christ* in the literal sense."[1] As for its relation to Baptism, "when we are baptized, we are only listed under the banner of Christ, marked for his soldiers, and sworn to be faithful; and not till Confirmation equipped for the battle, or furnished with arms to withstand the enemy." He insists that Confirmation "in the regular and ordinary administration of it, is as much required to go before the Eucharist, as Baptism." Finally, Confirmation is necessary to confirm the benefits of Baptism.

---

[1] vii. pp. 11, 12.

[2] Sermons, lxxxi-lxxxvi, printed in *Works*, vol. iii.

[3] Wheatley, *op. cit.* (ed. Oxford, 1846), p. 325. This book first appeared in a smaller and less complete form in 1710.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 326.

Wheatley deals thoroughly with the rubrics of the Office and discusses the age for Confirmation. "It is very evidently the design of our Church that children be confirmed before they have opportunities of being acquainted with sin; that so the Holy Spirit may take early possession of their youthful hearts, and prevent those sins, to which, without His assistance, the very tenderness of their age would be apt to expose them." Only they must be old enough to understand the nature of the rite and its obligations. Wheatley is emphatic that the bishops alone can minister Confirmation, and "ought therefore to do it often," and he notes that the *Reformatio Legum* seems to order it annually. Prayer and the laying on of hands are essential to the rite, the use of Unction is "primitive and Catholic." "Some contend that it was practised by the Apostles. . . . However, it is certain, that within a very few years after the Apostles, the holy Fathers used to apply *oil* and *balm* to those that were confirmed."[2] Indeed, it is difficult to discover from "the very ancientest fathers . . . whether it was of apostolical practice or not." The sign of the cross, too, reaches far back into primitive times, but since neither it nor unction have "any text of Scripture that is clear on their side," and it cannot be proved that they were of apostolical usage, the English Church has laid them aside.

The last collect in the Office, added in 1661, witnesses to the belief of "the ancients" that Confirmation was "a preservation both for body and soul"; he refers to St. Cyril of Jerusalem. Finally, Wheatley is most emphatic on the rule that Confirmation is necessary before admission to the Eucharist. The only reasons for exceptions are "the case of clinick baptism" or "the want of a bishop near the place," and he is careful to explain this twice.[1]

---

[1] Wheatley, *op. cit.* (ed. Oxford, 1846), p. 328.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 336, 337.

John Wesley, in his *Sermons*[2] and in his *Notes on the New Testament*,[3] the authorized standards of Methodist teaching, regards Confirmation by imposition of the hands of the bishop as being, in the primitive Church at least, the means of receiving the Holy Spirit.

The evidence of the Visitation Articles, after the Revolution of 1688, is less full than in the previous periods. Bishop Ironside, at Hereford in 1692, inquires "doth your Minister on Sundays instruct the Youth in the Church Catechism, and prepare them for confirmation by the Bishop?"[4] and adds to his Articles an Advertisement that "the Bishop at his Visitation will be ready to Confirm those that are brought to him and are fitted for that purpose."[5] Bishop Stratford, at Chester in 1701, inquires concerning catechizing and the presentation of the instructed to the bishop to be confirmed. He asks also whether any "of Age fit to receive" neglect Communion; though he does not add to the qualification of age, like some previous bishops, the mention of Confirmation. This may be only because he is inquiring, as the margin shows, about Canon 112.[6] But Bishop Stratford began a new practice of declaring an age limit for candidates. In a direction to "my Brethren of the Clergy," he writes, "You are desired to prepare the Young People of your Parish for Confirmation. And to the end it may be administered to the greater Edification of those who shall receive it, I desire you to take notice that I intend to confirm none but those who are of the age of Fourteen Years, and whose Names shall be delivered to me by the Ministers of the respective Parishes, . . . with a Certificate under their Hands that they have examined them (unless they be Persons of Ripe age) and find them not only capable of repeating the words of the Catechism, but that they understand the meaning of" the baptismal vow and declare they will " live answerable to it."[1] The Dean of the Arches visiting the Peculiars of Canterbury in 1703, inquired only about catechizing.[2] Fleetwood's interesting and original Articles for St. Asaph in 1710, the next in the series, have been cited already.[3]

---

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 338, 339 and p. 225.

[2] *Sermons*, ix. 17.

[3] *Notes*, etc., on Heb. vi. 1, 2.

[4] Appendix E, p. 658, "Concerning the Clergy," Art. 3.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 659.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 660, Tit. iii, Art. 6, Tit. iv, Art. 9.

Bishop Trimnell, at Norwich in 1716, inquires about catechizing and the preparation and presentation of the instructed to be confirmed[4]; he asks also whether any " of Age fit to receive " neglect Communion and whether any neglect or refuse to send their children and others to be catechized[5]; but the question about the parents bringing the children to be confirmed has dropped out.

Dr. Booth, Archdeacon of Durham at some date between 1710 and 1720,[6] shows, however, the care of the previous generation. He inquires concerning Sunday catechizing, and whether the instructed are prepared and presented to the Bishop.[7] He asks also " doth he (your Minister) admit any to the Holy Communion that are not *Confirmed*, or that are not ready and willing so to be," and he adds as his authorities for the question the " Rubrick after Confirmation " and Archbishop Peckham's Constitution as given in Lyndwode.[8] As he inquires also whether any of 16 do not communicate thrice a year and whether the parishioners refuse or neglect to send their children to be catechized,[9] making no allusion in either case to Confirmation, it is clear that such an omission does not necessarily imply neglect or depreciation of the rite.

Dr. Stanley, Archdeacon of London in 1728, inquired about instructing the youth in the Catechism, and whether the minister prepared them " against the Bishop's Confirmation ? "[10]

Three other Visitations may be noted. William Wake, then Bishop of Lincoln, visited his diocese in 1706, and added

---

[1] Appendix E, p. 662.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 663, Tit. iii, Art. 4.

[3] Above, pp. 184–186.

[4] App. E, p. 678, Tit. ii, Art. viii.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 679, Tit. iii, Art. viii.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 681 note.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 682, Tit. i, Section 2.

[8] *Ibid.* Tit. i, Section 10.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 684, Tit. iii (misprinted ii), Sections 5 and 7.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 680, Tit. iii, Art. 14.

(apparently) an Advertisement to his Articles, with detailed inquiries about each parish. None of them are concerned with Confirmation, and the formal Visitation Articles do not appear to be printed. Bishop Edmund Gibson, who succeeded Wake at Lincoln, visited in 1718 and again in 1721. He followed Wake's example of sending Queries to the clergy, but whether in addition to formal Visitation Articles the learned editor of the Answers to both Wake's and Gibson's questions does not explain.[1] Bishop Gibson does not inquire about Confirmation, but he does make careful investigation about catechizing. "How often, and at what Times, do you Catechize in your Church? Do your Parishioners duly send their Children and Servants to be instructed and Catechized? Do they learn any other Catechism for the better Understanding of that of the Church? What Catechism do they learn for that Purpose?"[2] The returns to this question are "most full, it being insisted on in every parish, and practised generally in Lent, and sometimes continued through the greater part of the Summer."[3] Though he does not ask about Confirmation, Bishop Gibson speaks of it at the close of the letter sent with his Queries. "I am aware," he writes, "that the Work of Visitation hath been usually accompanied with the Work of Confirmation." But ill-health has made it "hazardous, if not impracticable," for him to undertake both together, so that he has resolved "not to Confirm in the course of my Visitation; but to come again to you on purpose to perform that Work, when I shall have no other upon my Hands, nor any need of being attended by the officers of my Court." He thinks that "the Separation of these two Duties . . . will contribute to the Order and Solemnity of both," and he adds, "I take this opportunity to declare, that when I come to Confirm, I shall not be willing to admit any who are under the Age of fourteen years,"[4] thus following the example of Bishop Stratford at Chester in 1701. The last series of Visitation Articles for this period which I have found is that of Archbishop Herring of York for his primary Visitation in 1743. Dr. Herring had been chaplain to Bishop Fleetwood, and was consecrated to the see of Bangor in 1737. His inquiries, under eleven heads, are based, I judge, on the questions of Bishops Wake and Gibson at Lincoln. The Archbishop inquires about Confirmation: "Do you know of any who come to Church in your Parish . . . that being Baptized and of a competent Age, are not Confirmed?" (Art. vii), and he asks carefully about catechizing (Art. viii).[1] The answers returned to these and the other questions of Archbishop Herring are a mine of information for the condition of the English Church in the middle of the reign of George II; happily they are carefully preserved, and they are in process of being edited.[2] Out of 423 returns examined, only 15 report unconfirmed communicants; the form of answers in these cases shows that to have been admitted to Holy Communion was equivalent, in the writers'opinion, to Confirmation, so that subsequent Confirmation was rendered unnecessary. The 15 returns represent only 12 parish priests, some benefices being held in plurality.[3] The form of such a reply commonly is, "None of competent age who are not confirmed or have received the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." The evidence of Herring's Visitation of 1743 extends, indeed, to 1756, for Archbishop Matthew Hutton II, who succeeded Herring, has noted on the title-page of the first volume: "I have not found any material variation from the answers given in these four volumes either upon my own Inquiry, or by the returns of the Archdeacons after y^e Visitations. Complaints of the Increase of Methodism have been the Chief." Archbishop Hutton has dated it "1756."

---

[1] *Speculum Diœceseos Lincolniensis*, pt. i (1705-1723), ed. Canon R. E. G. Cole, *Lincoln Record Soc.* (1913), pp. ii-iv.

[2] *Ibid.* p. iv, Question 9. [3] *Ibid.* p. vi. [4] *Ibid.* p. iii.

Further evidence exists for the administration of Confirmation in the diocese of York at this period. Archbishop Herring, writing of his Visitation in 1743, declares: "I am confident I have confirmed about thirty thousand people."[1] But Confirmations had been infrequent under his unedifying, if not scandalous, predecessor, Lancelot Blackburne. The Vicar of Halifax, writing in 1761 to Archbishop Drummond, says: "Ye only Confirmn. here in Abp. Blackburne's time [Apb. Blackburne held the see from 1724 to 1743] was A.D. 1737, Septr. 10, 11, 12, 13 by his Grace's Representative, Bp. Benson,[2] number of y^e^ Confirm'd abt. 9,000. The only ones since his time were the 3 following, viz.:

---

[1] The Articles, with the answers returned to them, are among the MSS. of the Archbishop of York at Bishopthorpe.

[2] By the Rev. P. C. Walker, Rector of Lockington, and myself, for the Surtees Society.

[3] The extracts from the returns are printed in Appendix I.

In 1744 Jan. 5, 6, 7. By Archbp. Herring, number Confd. 4,000.
In 1747 in May, 2 or 3 days. By Archbp. Herring, No. 3,000.
In 1755 Octr. 14, 15, 16. By Bp. Keene[3] for Archbp. Hutton. No. 3,500."[4]

A contemporary letter from the same Vicar of Halifax of Oct. 12, 1737, gives an account of the Confirmation held there by Bishop Benson.[5]

"The Bp. of Gloucester is a man one wd. wish to spend a whole life with, instead of 2 or 3 days. He confirmed here and at Ripponden 8,922 or thereabouts by only 2 at a time, with great devotion and solemnity.

"He was in Church from abt. 9 in ye morning til near 7 at nights on y^{e} 10th and 11th of Sept. The consecration service at Ripponden on ye 9th of y^{t} month began at 10 in ye morning; ended abt. 12—after wh. he confirm'd abt. 1,500 there.

"The Churchwardens and Chapelwardens, who had each of ym a white staff, attended ye Confirmation. I took all ye Precautions I cd. to secure order at a time wh. I expected ye greatest want of it in this disorderly mob-situation. His Lp̄. seem'd to be much pleas'd and said many good natured things to me."[1]

---

[1] *D.N.B.* ix. 711, *s.v.* Herring, Thos.

[2] This was the devout Dr. Martin Benson, Bishop of Gloucester (1735 1752), the friend of Bishop Butler and brother-in-law of Archbishop Secker. Archbishop Blackburne left him a service of plate by his will, apparently as a return for his undertaking Confirmation.

[3] This was Dr. Edmund Keene, Bishop of Chester (1752-1771).

[4] The letter is printed in Appendix II.

[5] Dr. George Legh was Vicar of Halifax from 1731 to 1775.

In 1761 Archbishop Drummond, who had succeeded Dr. Gilbert at York in that year, was concerned about the lack of opportunities for Confirmation and the Registrar gave His Grace a list of those held, since 1748. They are printed below, with letters to and from Dr. Drummond, himself, then Bishop of St. Asaph in 1758.[2] They show the great number of candidates in Yorkshire alone in 1758, for the Bishop of Clogher (Dr. Hotham, later an East Riding baronet) had confirmed in the East Riding "upwards of 15,000," while the Bishop of St. Asaph had confirmed 15,000 in the West Riding, and the North Riding and the Nottinghamshire and Hexhamshire parts of the diocese seem to have been left alone. Ten years later, in 1768, Archbishop Drummond confirmed candidates, "age from 15 to 22," to the number of 17,777 at 14 centres (chiefly in the West Riding and at York) and in 1763 he had confirmed 15,827 in the same parishes, the increase being, as he observed, 1,950. In 1763 he confirmed in the Nottinghamshire part of his diocese 3,957; in 1768, at the same centres, 8,423—an increase of 4,466. In 1763 he confirmed at 7 centres in the North and East Ridings 5,896 candidates; in 1770 he confirmed at the same centres, 13,300—an increase between 1768 and 1770 of 13,820 candidates. In 1771 Archbishop Drummond confirmed at Stokesley (in the N. Riding) 2,100 candidates; so that the total number of those whom he confirmed in the years 1768-1771 was 41,600. The conditions under which Confirmation was administered to such enormous numbers, in churches which could accommodate but a small part of the candidates at one time, can be realized from the account of confirmations in the diocese of Ely in 1829 and 1833 below. Archbishop Drummond was alive to the evils of large confirmations; he had pointed them out in 1758 to his predecessor, Archbishop Gilbert. "Fewer numbers in a place and frequent confirmations will bring only the proper persons before you," he wrote, "and bring all into a juster sense of this reasonable institution."

---

[1] The letter is addressed to Thomas Hayter, then Archdeacon of York, and chaplain to Archbishop Blackburne, whose son Horace Walpole and others (apparently unjustly) assert that he was. It is among the Bishopthorpe MSS.

[2] In Appendix II.

Archbishop Drummond's practice, however, when he succeeded Archbishop Gilbert shows that he found his good advice difficult to carry out. One thing he did to make his confirmations more edifying: "The Archbishop uses and distributes a little tract on Confirmation by Dr. Worthington,[1] which he got printed."[2] But few, comparatively, of the candidates at that day would have been able to read it. Dr. Drummond died in December 1776, and there is no evidence that he confirmed after 1771.

The evidence for the later years of the eighteenth century, and for the earlier years of the nineteenth, points to the conclusion that carelessness and infrequency in administering Confirmation were reaching their lowest level, comparable only to the period of neglect when Calvinism was at its height two hundred years before.

Meanwhile, both in England and Scotland there had been developments on a very different line. The bishops and clergy who had been unable to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary in 1689 and had been deprived as Nonjurors, were strong believers in sacramental religion and in the Anglican appeal to the primitive Church. They continued the succession of bishops, on the ground that they were the true Church of England; one of the first two bishops so consecrated, in 1694 was Dr. George Hickes, the deprived Dean of Worcester, already mentioned. In 1718 a section of the Nonjurors who desired to return to the usages of the Prayer Book of 1549 began, under the authority of their bishops, to use a New Office which contained not only an Order for Holy Communion but also new Offices for Confirmation and the Visitation of the Sick.

---

[1] Dr. William Worthington (1703-1778), a learned incumbent of the diocese of St. Asaph, whom Archbishop Drummond made his chaplain and whom he preferred to the Prebend of South Newbald in 1762, and (on the death of Laurence Sterne) in 1768 to that of North Newbald. I have not met with a copy of the tract—it is not mentioned in the list of Dr. Worthington's works given in the *D.N.B.*

[2] Appendix II.

This Confirmation Order of 1718[1] followed the Order of the 1661 Prayer Book until the Prayer for the sevenfold Gift immediately before Confirmation; but that prayer was altered to the 1549 form, and to it was added (from the 1549 Book) the sentences: "Sign them, O Lord, and mark them to be thine for ever, by the virtue of thy holy Cross and Passion. Mercifully[2] confirm and strengthen them with the inward unction of thy Holy Ghost unto everlasting life. Amen." A rubric followed directing the candidates to kneel in order before the bishop, who is to anoint every one of them with the chrism or ointment, making the sign of the Cross upon their forehead and saying:

"N., I sign thee with the sign of the Cross, I anoint thee with Holy Ointment.

Then the Bishop shall lay his hand upon the head of the Person he is confirming, and say,

And I lay my hand upon thee: In the Name of the Father, etc.

And the Bishop, keeping his hand still upon the Person's head, shall say,

Defend, O Lord, this thy child (*or*, this thy servant), etc. [as in the 1661 Order].

After all have been confirmed the Bishop shall say:

The peace of the Lord be always with you.

Answer. And with thy spirit," and the service ended with the Lord's Prayer and the two Collects, as in the 1661 Order.

A rubric ordered that when Persons are confirmed who have been of riper years when they were baptized, the initial Preface and Question were to be omitted.

The final rubric directed the bishop, before beginning the Office, to take "some Chrism or Ointment; and putting it into a decent vessel, to stand and consecrate it in manner and form following, unless he hath some by him, already consecrated." The form is very brief.

"*Bishop.* The Lord be with you.

Answer. And with thy spirit.

Bishop. Let us pray.

And the People kneeling, the Bishop shall say:

---

[1] Printed in Appendix III below.

[2] This adverb is an addition to the 1549 form.

O Lord of Mercies, and Father of lights, from whom every good and perfect gift proceedeth; Send down, we beseech thee, thine Holy Spirit to sanctify this Ointment: And grant, that all those who after Baptism shall be anointed therewith, may be cleansed and purified both in body and soul, be confirmed in godliness, and obtain the blessings of the Holy Ghost; who, with the Father and the Son, liveth and reigneth ever one God, world without end. Amen.

Then the People shall stand up, and the Bishop shall proceed to the Office.

The Matter of the Chrism or Ointment for Confirmation is sweet Oil of Olives, and precious Balsam commonly called Balm of Gilead."

The new Office divided the Nonjurors into Usagers and Non-usagers; finally, the Usagers agreed to lay aside the use of the New Office as from September 1732.[1] The agreement was concerned with the Order for Holy Communion, and it may be doubted whether the new order for Confirmation was laid aside. It had excited, apparently, no controversy.

A party of the Usagers held out and continued a succession of bishops of their own until 1805. The best known of this group is Dr. Thomas Deacon (1697-1753), who issued for his congregations in Manchester and in London a *Compleat Collection of Devotions*.[2] It contained an Order of Confirmation. This followed the 1549 Book, beginning with the versicles and omitting the Preface and Question. The Prayer for the Sevenfold Gift is that of 1718 with a slight alteration, but the anointing is changed to an Eastern form: "N. the servant of God is sealed with the seal of the Cross, and anointed with Holy Ointment, as an emblem of the inward unction of the Holy Spirit. In the Name of the Father," etc.

After the Confirmation the bishop prays that "this chrism may be effectual in these baptized children," etc., and the service ends as in the 1718 book, with the last Collect omitted. In the rubrics stress is laid on the presence of the sponsor, who shall "hold the child," and the Deacon is to say "Let us pray," or "Let us attend," as need occurs. A rubric adds that if a child has received private Baptism and then been anointed with chrism (which each Priest must obtain from the bishop), the anointing at Confirmation shall be omitted.

---

[1] Broxap, *The Later Nonjurors* (1924), p. 171.

[2] London. Printed for the Author, 1734. The order for Confirmation is in pp. 134-138. It is printed in Appendix III.

The Form of Consecrating the Chrism for Confirmation is given, the Consecration taking place after the Nicene Creed at the Eucharist. The form is practically that in the 1718 Book. Among this group of Nonjurors Confirmation was, normally, given to infants. Thus in England, from 1718 until the end of the century, Confirmation with chrism was being given by bishops who traced their descent from Archbishops Laud and Sancroft.

Among the persecuted remnant of the Church in Scotland a like revival was taking place, and some of the Scots bishops restored the use of chrism in Confirmation. One immediate result of the Revolution of 1688 in Scotland was that, by the expulsion of the bishops, Confirmation almost entirely lapsed, except in secret. Bishop Thomas Rattray (1684-1743) writing of the period immediately following the Revolution, says: "As for the sacred ordinance of Confirmation, which the primitive and Catholick Church always looked on as so very necessary for conferring the Holy Spirit on such as had received the Baptism of Water, it was not at all used by us."[1]

How secret confirmations were is seen in a letter from Bishop John Falconar to Bishop Millar in November 1718. Falconar is writing of St. Andrews: "I purpose," he writes, "by God's assistance to attempt confirming of the well-disposed Students, and to perform Worship and to administer the Sacraments to the good people in that place . . . but this with outmost secrecy and caution, insomuch that I purpose to try if something may be done this way on such week days as are less opposed to observation."[2]

---

[1] From a MS. by Bishop Rattray, transcribed by Bishop Jolly. The original, in 1908, was in the possession of the Bishop of Edinburgh, Dr. Dowden. It is printed in the *Scotichronicon* of Dr. J. F. S. Gordon (Glasgow, 1867). The quotation here is from vol. ii, p. 111 of that work.

[2] *Scotichronicon*, ii. 133.

Bishop Falconar had in 1713 consulted his colleague, Bishop Gadderar (then in London) about the case of a candidate for confirmation.[1] Gadderar replied: "Confirmation cannot come too soon after Baptism, and he" (*i.e.* "our most worthy friend whose opinion you desired") "is satisfyed that Unction is very ancient, and was used in Confirmation in the Primitive Church. . . . I have consulted" (the ancient Liturgies) "both of Greek and Latine Churches, particularly as to Chrism," and he encloses a transcript of his researches. He adds that he is "jealous" of introducing Rites and Ceremonies, "not expressly of Divine and Apostolical institution," and "the Ch. of Rome's altering the Apostolic Rite of Imposition of Hands in Confirmation into that of Crossing the Forehead with the Thumb, dipt in the Chrism, is what I cannot approve of."[2] A letter from the learned and holy Bishop Spinckes which follows shows that the candidate had asked to be confirmed with chrism. Spinckes's opinion is the more interesting both because the question of such a use had not then been revived in England and because he became the leader of the Non-usager party among the Nonjurors. He had been consecrated Bishop three months when he wrote to Bishop Falconar: "It is certain that Chrysm after Baptism was a very ancient usage, but not instituted in Scripture; for which reason I take Confirmation by laying on the hand and Benediction, to be as complete as by Unction. And since our Church directs to that method, I should not think it proper to use Unction, because it is a variation from my Rule, to which I think I ought no more to add than to detract from it. But you in Scotland, being not under the same obligation, are more at liberty to act as you shall think most proper. Nor do I think, if you use Unction, you need concern yourself about the Composition for it, since we have no certainty how it was made anciently, nor can have; but any sweet oil seems to me sufficient. By this you will see my opinion is not only that you may safely gratify the gentleman in his request, but that you may do it in what method you like best." He proceeds to advise secrecy about it because of "the ignorant and malicious."

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 145. Bishop Dowden conjectures that the candidate was Thomas Rattray the future bishop and that "our most worthy friend" was Bishop Collier. It is rash to differ from so great a scholar, but I think from the P.S. to the letter, that the authority consulted was Bishop Hickes, and the references in the letter itself to Hickes's *Thesaurus* rather confirm this view.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 146.

Certainly Bishop Rattray was confirmed with chrism, for he says of it, in a letter of June 9, 1731, to Bishop Keith, "*I was so confirmed myself*, and that even by Bp. Spinckes' knowledge and consent as I can show by a letter under his hand—as well as by Bp. Rose's of Edinburgh."[1]

Bishop Falconar, above mentioned, was a Scots gentleman of good family, ordained priest in 1683 by the Bishop of Ross (John Patterson) and ejected in 1688 from the rectory of Carnbee, Fife. On April 28, 1709, he was consecrated Bishop at Dundee, and he died on July 6, 1723. Thus the revival of chrism in Confirmation in England by the Nonjurors in 1718 had been anticipated five years before by a bishop in Scotland.

Bishop Falconar was urgent about Confirmation, for, in a letter of January 10, 1721, he tells his correspondent, Bishop Archibald Campbell, that he has given three short discourses to his clergy, one about Confirmation, another about the Eucharist, and a third about preparation for it. He hoped that these, and some other methods which he described, would lead his clergy "into an acquaintance and love of what is primitive."[2]

That Bishop Falconar and Bishop Rattray both administered Confirmation with chrism is perfectly clear from MSS. in the Episcopal Chest at Edinburgh. Bishop Falconar's Form for Confirmation, in his own handwriting, is there,[3] a very short Office; and his prayer for consecrating the chrism is also preserved[4]; Bishop Rattray's *Order of Confirmation* is also at Edinburgh. The form for consecrating the chrism is longer than that of Bishop Falconar, or of the Books of 1718 and 1734.[1]

---

[1] *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*, Nov. 1852, p. 246, in a learned article by Dr. Wm. Bright (afterwards Regius Professor of Eccles. History at Oxford) on "Bishop John Falconar and His Friends."

[2] *Scotichronicon*, ii. 139.

[3] See Appendix III.

[4] Printed in Appendix III.

Whether Confirmation with Chrism was continued in Scotland after the death of Bishop Rattray in 1743 there is, apparently, no evidence to show. After the '45, penal laws were enforced, and a system relatively as ferocious as Louis XIV's persecutions of the Huguenots was established. Andrew Gerard (consecrated Bishop of Aberdeen July 17, 1747) writing in 1746, gives an awful picture of the Church in the Highlands: meeting-houses gutted, houses of the better class destroyed, "so that these people have no shadow of any public worship; . . . we are informed that those in Edinburgh have all given it up."[2] Yet the flocks remained faithful, for in July 1750, Bishop Gerard tells of a visit to Buchan, when "betwixt three and four hundred passed under my hands," and two months later he records that he had confirmed 250 persons in Garioch. Much later, in 1785, the same Bishop records that "there is an extent of country in the Highlands under my charge where they have had no settled clergyman since the '45, but only a supply once, twice, or thrice in the year, and some years none at all, where nevertheless they adhere strictly to the communion of the Church, and I had this summer to confirm there above 500."[3] The *Journals* of Bishop Robert Forbes (1708-1775), consecrated to the See of Ross and Caithness in 1762, show a like earnest desire for Confirmation. Thus the Bishop gives the names of the 616 persons confirmed by him, in 1762, and in 1770 he records the names of 553 whom he confirmed at three centres in his remote diocese.[4] Bishop Robert Forbes is particularly interesting, indeed probably unique, because it was given to him to confirm a bishop with whom he was in communion. This was Bishop Robert Gordon, the last bishop of the regular line of the English Nonjurors, who had been consecrated at Wye in Kent, on St. Barnabas' Day, 1741, by Bishops Thomas Brett, George Smith, and Timothy Mawman. In August 1769 the two bishops met at Moffat, in Dumfriesshire, and Bishop Gordon told Forbes that he "had great doubts of ever having received the benefit of confirmation. For though his mother used to say he had been confirmed, yet he could never recollect hands having been laid upon him, and that he had received the sealing benediction. He well remembered that, when between 11 and 12 years of age, he had been in the quire at Durham with a crowd of boys, when Lord Crew was bishop, and that he then saw several young folks confirmed, but he did not remember that he himself had kneeled down and received that benefit. He, therefore, begged me that to remove all doubts and scruples from his mind I might make up this defect. Agreed—and to-morrow's morning was accordingly appointed before breakfast for that purpose in his own bedchamber, none to be present but Mrs. Forbes only."[1] Accordingly on "Wednesday, August 9th, 'twixt 9 and 10 in the morning, in Bishop Gordon's own bedchamber, the defect was made up as agreed upon, none being present but Mrs. Forbes," and Bishop Forbes concludes: "*Soli Deo, Patri, Filio, Spiritui que Sancto sit laus et gloria in sæcula sæculorum. Amen et Amen.*"[2] Doubtless the hour "before breakfast" was fixed upon to allow the rite to be received fasting.

---

[1] See Appendix III.

[2] *Scottish Church Review*, September 1884, p. 586.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 587.

[4] *Journals, etc., of Bishop Robert Forbes*, ed. J. B. Craven (London, 1886), pp. 249 *seq.*, 327 *seq.*

In England the evidence for the teaching of the doctrine of Confirmation, at this period, comes chiefly from those who were connected, in more or less degree, with the bishops of Scotland.

John Bowdler (1746-1823) the friend of Joshua Watson, and one of the group which founded the National Society and the Church Building Society early in the nineteenth century, had been brought up a Nonjuror and had attended Bishop Gordon on his death-bed in November 1779. He had, with the rest of the English Nonjurors of the "Regular" body, returned to communion with the English Church when the Scots bishops did so in 1790, if, indeed, he did not do so before.

Bowdler was exceedingly zealous for "a reformation in manners," and in 1796 he wrote a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury[1] making suggestions for the punishment of adultery, the prohibition of gaming, etc. He added a desire for stricter regulations to compel bishops to reside in their dioceses and clergy on their benefices, and "the administration of the rite of confirmation in so many places as to put an end to the crowd and confusion that too frequently attend it." John Bowdler sent this letter also to two of the best bishops of the day, Porteus of London and Horsley of Rochester; both of them replied sympathetically, but left unmentioned the suggested reform of confirmations.[2]

---

[1] *The Lyon in Mourning* (Scottish Hist. Society, 1896), iii. 231.

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 236.

More remarkable was a letter written by Mr. Bowdler to a young man who was his godson, dealing with Confirmation. Mr. Bowdler explained the purpose of Confirmation as the taking "upon yourself the promises made by your sponsors." It is, "in fact, a part of baptism and the completion of it. . . . I believe," he adds, "that there is always a confirmation at Bow Church, before Easter; and as you are now of sufficient age and understanding to be confirmed, it is my duty, as one of your godfathers, to beg you to defer it no longer; but to enquire when the next confirmation will be, and to attend accordingly."[3] Mr. Bowdler clearly proposed that his godson should both prepare and present himself; accordingly he gives directions for preparation, which, he says, "is not difficult. Read over, carefully, the offices of *public Baptism* and *Confirmation*, in your common prayer-book, and the chapter for Ember days in Whitsun week in Nelson's Companion for the Festivals . . . and these will give you all the information and instructions requisite." After Confirmation "you are completely a Christian." Mr. Bowdler concludes by warning the young man against Deism and sends him Skelton's *Sermons* and Nelson *On the Sacrament*, emphasizing "the Holy Eucharist" as the great means of grace.[4] Bowdler, it will be observed, lays stress on the subjective side of Confirmation, and in his letter makes no mention of the gift of the Holy Spirit; possibly because, as a godparent, the baptismal vow and its renewal were nearest to his mind.

---

[1] Dr. John Moore, who held the see, 1783-1805.

[2] *Memoir of the Life of John Bowdler, Esq.* (by his son, Thomas Bowdler), London (not pubd.), 1824, pp. 159, 160.

[3] *Op. cit.* pp. 115, 116.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 116.

William Stevens (1732-1807), a learned and devout London merchant, for many years Treasurer of Queen Anne's Bounty, and founder of the famous Club of "Nobody's Friends," was a close friend of John Bowdler. Mr. Stevens wrote, in 1766, a most valuable essay on *Confirmation*, for the use of one about to be confirmed. It teaches very clearly:

1. That Heb. vi. 2 necessarily implies that Confirmation is "as universal in its observation as Baptism itself."

2. That it is an apostolical practice, from Acts viii. 12 and xix. 1-6. Further, on the grounds of reason, since Confirmation is practised by the Universal Church and was never instituted by any Council and in this resembled the observance of the Lord's Day, that it is of apostolical and, consequently, of Divine institution.

3. That the Apostles were, and their successors the bishops are, the proper ministers of it.

4. That "the whole ritual part of it consists in prayer and imposition of hands."

5. That the grace obtained by its worthy reception is a further gift of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Ghost, in Confirmation, "comes upon us with more mighty and powerful assistance, to strengthen us with grace in the inner man."

6. Since it is of Divine institution, ordained by God as a means of conveying a further supply of grace to the baptized, it is a duty to seek it.[1]

Here there is no mention of the renewal of the baptismal vows nor of the confirming of the promise.

Both Stevens and Bowdler were generous in assisting the Bishops in Scotland, and yet another writer of this period was attached to the Nonjuror bishops there by a different tie. When the English bishops were afraid or unwilling to consecrate bishops for the United States, Dr. Samuel

---

[1] Printed as Appendix I to the *Memoirs of William Stevens, Esq.*, by Sir J. A. Park, new ed. (1859), pp. 147-150.

Seabury (1729-1796) applied to the Nonjuror Bishops of Scotland and was consecrated by them on November 14, 1784. His teaching on Confirmation appears clearly in his *Discourses*, published in 1815[1]:

"That the design of the rite is to confer the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit, appears from St. Paul's asking the Ephesian converts whether they had received the Holy Ghost since they believed, and from the visible effects that followed the laying of his hands upon them. The modern term *confirmation* is, I know, generally understood by people to mean no more than their ratifying and confirming the vow and profession they made, or that was made by others in their name, at their baptism. But, in truth, this is but one part of the meaning even of that word."[2]

A colleague of Bishop Seabury's in the American episcopate, Bishop Ravenscroft of North Carolina (1772-1830), in a sermon on Confirmation, taught that the rite was of apostolical appointment, that it was "the ordinary and appointed mode" by which the baptized might "receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," and dwelt also on the point emphasized by Thorndike, that one purpose of Confirmation was "to establish believers in the vital doctrine of the unity of the Church." A further purpose of Confirmation was, Bishop Ravenscroft taught, following primitive authorities, "to cure any defects . . . in the administration of Baptism."[3]

But the temper of the teaching about Confirmation in England is shown by Bishop Heber, in his critical examination of Bishop Jeremy Taylor's works, published in 1822. Heber does not think Taylor's *Discourse of Confirmation* "a favourable specimen of his genius"; he holds the suggestion that at Confirmation a special guardian angel is given "solemn trifling," and he is still more shocked at Taylor's "dangerous admission "that Confirmation is, really, as generally necessary as Baptism or the Lord's Supper." This is, Heber declares, "to contradict the express doctrine of our Church, and formally to elevate it to the rank of a Sacrament."

---

[1] *Discourses on Several Subjects*, 2 vols.

[2] *Op. cit.* i. 130, quoted in an art. by J. M. Dawson on "Seabury as a Preacher," *Scottish Church Review*, Oct. 1884, p. 663. Other passages from this sermon of Bishop Seabury are quoted in Bishop A. C. A. Hall's *Confirmation.*

[3] The passages are quoted by Bishop A. C. A. Hall in his *Confirmation*, pp. 100-102, from Bishop Ravenscroft's *Works* (1830), i, 493, 495, 497.

He remarks, further, that Bishop Taylor's opinion about the proper age of candidates for Confirmation is "at variance with the usual practice of the Church of England, which is seldom to admit them to the solemn rite till they are fourteen or fifteen years of age." With the main points of Taylor's book Heber agrees and concludes his criticisms with the judgment that "on the whole, the learning and piety of this little tract are not unworthy of Taylor."[1]

As Bishop of Calcutta, Heber was active and zealous in his administration of Confirmation, and he adopted the apparently novel practice of giving an address after the laying on of hands, *e.g.* at St. Thomas's, Bombay, April 25, 1825, his Archdeacon records, "After the Confirmation, the Bishop, as was his usual custom, addressed the candidates from the rails of the Communion-table,"[2] and there are several references to the same practice in his Life.

The evidence of William Stevens and John Bowdler would seem to show that definite preparation for receiving Confirmation had ceased to be, in the later eighteenth century, a regular feature of the Church in England, and that candidates, at least of the educated classes, prepared themselves. Notices of any preparation are rare in the eighteenth century; but Cowper, the poet (when a boy at Westminster), records the pains taken for his preparation by the excellent Head Master, Dr. Nicoll.[3] Cowper was at Westminster from 1741 to 1749. Evidence of a very different sort for the later period is given by Dr. George Moberly (1803-1885), Bishop of Salisbury, who went to Winchester as a boy of twelve in 1816. "My preparation for Confirmation," he writes, "was *nil.*

---

[1] Bishop Heber's *Life of Jeremy Taylor*, prefixed to his edition of the *Complete Works*, I, pp. cclvi-cclxx.

[2] *Life of Bishop Heber*, by his widow (1830), ii. 303.

[3] Prebendary of Westminster, 1740 to his death in 1765.

One day a lot of boys were sent for to the master's study: we had just come off 'Hills,' and were hot and tired, and I was faint; thereupon the master sent me away, and I never heard a word on the subject from that time to the actual Confirmation."[1] Dr. Moberly was himself Head Master of Winchester from 1835 to 1866, and his preparation of the boys for Confirmation was exceedingly thorough and conscientious, probably far more thorough and searching than that in any other public school at that time.[2]

The administration of Confirmation at the end of the eighteenth century and at the beginning of the nineteenth seems to have become in some dioceses, if not generally, a grave scandal. Mr. Bowdler's appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1796 has already been noticed,[3] but there is fuller evidence in a rare little book of 1833. This is *A Solemn Appeal to the Right Reverend the Bishop and to the Reverend the Clergy of the Diocese of Ely on the Disorder and Profaneness exhibited at the Parish Church of St. Michael's Cambridge on the occasion of the Confirmation held there, June* 20, 1833.[4] The writer, the Rev. William Cecil, Rector of Long Stanton St. Michael's, gives an account of the confirmation, to which he had taken his candidates, and adds to it a narrative of a former confirmation in 1825. The story is so disgraceful that a printed label in the cover of the book states that it "is printed solely for the inspection of the Bishops and their Chaplains together with the Clergy within the Diocese of Ely." Mr. Cecil,[5] who was an Evangelical, shrank, he says, from touching the subject "in this public manner"; but the scenes he had witnessed compelled him to protest. Shortly, he tells how the candidates from his parish having met at his house at 8 a.m., set off for Cambridge and reached the church at 10.30.[1] They sat in the church till 3 p.m., "without any prospect of getting the children confirmed: while around me is a scene of confusion, noise, talking, laughing, crying out, and struggling. Young men and young women indecently crowded together in the aisle, and struggling for hours in breathless turmoil: the rest of the congregation, some climbing over the tops of the pews, most of them standing on the seats or sitting on the pew-backs."[2] The service, at 11.15, began with the Litany; at its conclusion "the Bishop began to confirm the young persons in the chancel. . . . The confirming went on for about two hours; during which time the middle aisle was crowded with a mixed mob of boys and girls, standing before the Chancel doors and struggling for precedency in the next admission."[3] Mr. Cecil goes on to tell how "during two or three hours the crowd continued in the middle aisle waiting to be admitted into the chancel, . . . not having any to direct them, except as I occasionally saw some rough unmannerly officer come up to the chancel doors from within, and thence fulminate menaces and objurgations upon the mingled throng, as often as the uproar increased to a pitch beyond sufferance." Meanwhile, "the young people took these unmeaning rebuffs very quietly and continued standing for admittance; . . . by this time many of the females were beginning to faint: and the next opening of the chancel doors was accompanied by an order from the Bishop, that 'none but girls should be admitted,'[4] and after much struggling the girls were got into the chancel." Next, "about this time the Bishop read his charge and retired, as I supposed, from the silence which ensued." Then one boy, by climbing over some high pews, "reached the chancel doors; and then, squeezing his body through one of the open pannels, in the upper part of the door, he effected his admission into the chancel. . . . About half-a-dozen more boys, witnessing the success of the first, follow in the same track and so present themselves to the Bishop."

---

[1] *Dulce Domum* (1911), by C. A. E. Moberly, p. 22.

[2] See the full details in *Dulce Domum*, pp. 124-127.

[3] Above, p. 209.

[4] Cambridge. Printed by W Metcalfe, St. Mary's Street, Cambridge, 1833. I owe my knowledge of this rare work to the kindness of the Very Reverend Dr. Kirkpatrick, Dean of Ely, who has allowed me to use his copy.

[5] He was a son of the famous Evangelical divine Richard Cecil, 1748-1810, and, born in 1792, lived till 1882. He was Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge, having been Bell Scholar in 1811 and 17th Wrangler in 1814. He was Rector of Long Stanton 1823-1882, and wrote, in later life, on Church music and Spanish poetry.

---

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 19, note C.

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 9.

[3] *Op. cit.* p. 11.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 13, 14.

The writer tells how, in the pew adjoining his, a number of lads were talking, one was eating cherries, another cracking nuts, the shells of which he was throwing about. Then came a fresh scrimmage as the boys and girls from the gallery descended to join the crowd in the church, and "about this time, the Charge was read over again the second time; . . . but in the present confusion no one in the body of the church could hear or understand it: it was spoken to the air, and the Confirmation went on."[1] At length, about three o'clock, Mr. Cecil, with his boy candidates, left their pew, and, on the opening of the chancel doors, following the throng in the middle aisle, "amidst most tumultuous crowding, entered the chancel. In this short distance of five or six yards," he says, "my gown was rent and my coat so torn, that I was unable to return home with it in that state." In the chancel wild confusion reigned, and the candidates were "some sitting, some standing on the benches. The middle area, to about six feet of the altar, was occupied by a dense and mixed mob of males and females, chiefly males." After "waiting about another hour in the chancel, we moved forward toward the altar; and one by one the lads were confirmed; not in any order, but 'coming up as they could.' Two of them, while reverently kneeling before the Bishop, were taken by the shoulder and thrust back again into the crowd because" it was thought that females were to be confirmed first. However, at length the boys were confirmed and "we left the church at four o'clock, having been present five hours and a half, amidst scenes of disorder, distraction, and temptation." One boy, however, was detained "by an officious door-keeper" till five o'clock "that he might hear the Bishop's Charge read the third time over."[2] As for the scenes outside the church, Mr. Cecil quotes a description of them from *The Christian Guardian* of July 1833, and he prints a letter to the Bishop of Ely, written but not sent, which describes a like scene of riot and disorder in the same church in 1825.[3] There can be little wonder that one parent replied to Mr. Cecil, seeking to prepare his children for Confirmation, "I shall not hinder my children from going to Confirmation, if they desire it; but I cannot advise them to do it; I remember attending the Confirmation at Cambridge, when I myself was young, and *I never was so frightened in my life*"; while another parent said, "The young people may go if they are set upon it: I shall not forbid them; but I have seen the mode of conducting Confirmations at Cambridge for many years, and *I cannot call it a religious ordinance*."[1]

---

[1] *Op. cit.* pp. 15, 16. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 18, 19. [3] *Ibid.* pp. 24-28.

Mr. Cecil quotes a brother clergyman who, on some other occasion, "brought his son for confirmation, and having waited for five hours in the church to no purpose, at four in the afternoon he observed his son, engaged in the 'dreadful' scuffle and press before the chancel doors, with every symptom of distress and violent exertion,"[2] and further tells how a neighbouring parson observed some candidates from a neglected parish at the 1833 Confirmation whose conduct in the church presented "an example of gross indecency too offensive to appear in print."[3] These grave scandals were not confined to the diocese of Ely. In Lent 1851 twenty-four clergy of the diocese of Gloucester and Bristol presented a statement to their Bishop in which they detail some abuses of the existing order.[4] "Confirmation," they say, "is not much more frequent now than as required by the Canon of 1603; though the population is probably at least four times as great, and in consequence a large proportion of the professed members of our Church are never admitted to an ordinance which is numbered by the Apostle among the fundamentals of Christianity; and some of the Confirmations are necessarily so crowded, so disorderly, and so hurried that there must be much in them to pain all reverent minds, and to give great offence (as we fear) to Almighty God."[5]

---

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 32. [2] *Ibid.* p. 84. [3] *Ibid.* p. 84, note *.

[4] *The Real Causes of "The Papal Aggression" Considered*, etc. (Oxford and London), J. H. Parker, 1851.

[5] *Op. cit.* p. 17. The Bishop to whom the letter was addressed was Dr. J. H. Monk, who held the see from 1836 to 1856.

Mr. Cecil, in his book, points out very clearly the causes of the disorders he laments, particularly the infrequency of confirmations. " Five days, once in four years, is the period of time allotted for the confirming of the whole diocese " of Ely,[1] and he sets forth the times and places, from the official notice of 1833, pointing out that the arrangements for that year are an improvement on previous custom, since one or two more centres are appointed and Visitation and Confirmation are not held at the same time.[2]

Improvement came slowly and, at first, from the Evangelicals. Mr. Cecil, as has been said, was of that school, and he prints a course of five lectures in preparation for Confirmation, in an appendix to his book. He had only a week or ten days in which to prepare his candidates, but he gathered them one or two evenings in the chancel of the church, " dispensed with the formality of the pulpit," and instructed them from a chair.[3] His instructions begin with Baptism and the need of ratifying the vows; they proceed to Confirmation as preparatory to Holy Communion. The age for Confirmation is stated definitely to be " fourteen." [4] Mr. Cecil goes through the Confirmation service and quotes Hooker on the use of imposition of hands in Holy Scripture. Further, he quotes Heb. vi and Acts viii as scriptural authority for Confirmation, and sees a proof of it in Acts xv. 41; he teaches clearly that Confirmation conveys a gift of the Holy Ghost. He supports this teaching by references to the usual passages in Tertullian, Irenæus, St. Cyprian, and St. Jerome. He deals, next, more fully with the baptismal vow, and then with the way of acceptance with God; this is treated most fully, in accordance with the teaching of the older Evangelicals. Further he privately examines each candidate for a quarter of an hour in the Catechism and adds some personal exhortations.[5] One point in Mr. Cecil's book is specially interesting: he desires a reform in the Confirmation service itself. He suggests that it should begin with the

---

[1] *A Solemn Appeal*, etc., p. 43.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 44. [3] *Ibid.* p. 56. [4] *Ibid.* p. 62.

[5] The Instructions occupy pp. 57-79 of the book.

Litany, followed by a Charge from the Bishop (from the pulpit), then the preface read by a chaplain, then the question asked by the Bishop and, after the prayer for the sevenfold Gift, "if it be no violation of the rubric, and if the Bishop see fit, at this division of the service may be sung a hymn, invoking the Presence of the Holy Spirit upon those who are come expecting that heavenly gift."[1] The laying on of hands and the prayers follow, and then "at this part of the service, some of our Bishops, as I am informed, very properly address the congregation in a few words of comfort and congratulation. The whole assembly then join in a psalm of praise to the Holy Trinity, and the Bishop concludes with the blessing."[2] Such was an ideal service of Confirmation as sketched in 1833.

One preparation for Confirmation at this period is almost historical, that of Charlotte Yonge by Mr. Keble in 1838. Twice a week, from August to October, the instruction continued, though in subsequent years the instruction of the candidates was more minute, beginning earlier and continuing longer. Miss Yonge tells how Mr. Keble explained, first, the true import of Confirmation, then went through the Catechism, then "through the ritual for each of the two great Sacraments, comparing it step by step with elder liturgies, chiefly using Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*, and he translating from Greek authorities."[3]

That the practice of Confirmation was not everywhere so bad as in the diocese of Ely, Mr. Cecil himself testifies. He tells of his own confirmation, at the age of fourteen, in a church in London, where all was quiet and orderly and there was nothing to offend,[4] and he has heard that in the diocese of Lincoln the number of confirmations has increased nearly threefold,[5] and in the dioceses of Winchester[1] and of Chester[2] confirmations were being held with due reverence.

---

[1] *A Solemn Appeal*, etc., p. 52.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 53.

[3] *Musings over "The Christian Year,"* etc., by C. M. Yonge (2nd ed. 1872), pp. iv, v.

[4] *A Solemn Appeal*, etc., p. 46.

[5] The Bishop of Lincoln, 1827 to 1853, was Dr. Kaye, an Evangelical.

These dioceses were then held by Evangelicals, and from them came the first attempts at reform in the practice of confirmation in the nineteenth century. The first Evangelical to be consecrated to an English see was Dr. Henry Ryder, who became Bishop of Gloucester in 1815 and was translated to Lichfield in 1824; his Lichfield confirmations were a very striking part of his work.

"All the resources of a loving, holy soul were poured upon them. He sent a printed letter to the parents and god-parents of every candidate before the event, and Archdeacon Hodson, his chaplain, gave a second letter to each of the candidates as they rose from under the imposition of hands. Then followed a short pastoral charge from the pulpit, which the bishop repeated from place to place with marvellous power."[3]

Bishop Charles Sumner, at Winchester, was specially careful in the administration of Confirmation. His addresses were fresh and stirring, and he multiplied Confirmation centres in his large diocese (it extended from Southwark to the Channel Islands). The extent of his reforms can be judged from the fact that in 1797 there were 16 Confirmation centres in Hampshire and the same number in 1822, whereas in 1832 Bishop Sumner had increased them to 45, and his Confirmation tour lasted over a month. In 1830 the Confirmation centres in Surrey were 24. Bishop Sumner had increased them by 1863 to 56.[4]

Yet the perfunctory administration of the rite went on elsewhere. Mr. Gladstone used to tell how Archbishop Vernon-Harcourt, who held the see of York from 1807 to 1847, used to administer Confirmation in York Minster. The nave would be filled with candidates from the surrounding towns and villages and the hubbub of talk would be stilled by vergers calling, "Silence for the Archbishop!" His Grace would then appear, and ascend a pulpit placed for the purpose. Presumably the Office was said, but, when the time came for the imposition of hands, the Archbishop, standing in the pulpit, would extend his hands over the multitude and repeat the words of Confirmation once, then the last prayers were said and the Archbishop withdrew, though he had not laid his hands on the head of any single candidate.[1] This and other abuses which had in the later eighteenth and earlier nineteenth century gathered round the administration of Confirmation were swept away by one who had been an archdeacon of Bishop Charles Sumner's, and was, at last, to succeed him in the see of Winchester. This was the famous Dr. Samuel Wilberforce, consecrated to the bishopric of Oxford in 1845.[2] Possibly Bishop Wilberforce's practice owed something to the example set by Bishop Charles Sumner and the other Evangelical bishops already mentioned; but his confirmations soon became so famous that, by themselves, they set a standard which was gradually followed in other dioceses until it became, as it now is, the normal use. Dean Burgon (1815-1888) wrote that "above all, in his manner of performing the rite of Confirmation, was Bishop Wilberforce felicitous. . . . Men are now grown so used to his method (for it has been freely reproduced in other dioceses) that they lose sight of the purely perfunctory method of administering the sacred rite which would appear to have prevailed universally in the first quarter of the present century" (he was writing in 1888); "when, hurriedly to lay hands on row after row of children kneeling before the Communion-rails, and, at each relay of candidates, to pronounce the words of blessing once for all—was regarded as the sum of the Bishop's function. Wilberforce used to commence the rite with a short, earnest, affectionate Address, during which the candidates were requested to stand—while the rest of the congregation sat."[1] Dean Burgon describes the variety of the Bishop's appeal, with vivid examples, and continues: "A brief period of silence was maintained in the church for the purpose of invoking a blessing on those who were about to be confirmed; and when all was ended, a second Address— a kind of parting Charge—was delivered to the Candidates. . . . Lookers on were melted to tears; and those who were proof against such outward signs of emotion freely owned that they had never before seen anything of the sort so admirably done."[2] Canon Ashwell, in the *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*,[3] records, justly, the "prodigious impression which his Confirmations always made alike upon the young and upon the old," and even the present writer has heard, from those who have been present, of the ineffaceable mark made by the words of Bishop Wilberforce on such occasions. The Bishop himself soon noted the demand Confirmations made upon him: "There is so much of deep interest in a Confirmation that it takes a great deal out of one."[4] Dean Burgon illustrates the Bishop's method with striking anecdotes which show with what astonishing results he was able to use the occasion of Confirmation. Certainly if Bishop Wilberforce was, as Dean Burgon holds, "the Remodeller of the Episcopate," he was above all the Remodeller of the practice of administering Confirmation, and the rite, which had reached the lowest depth of slovenliness and disorder in the early nineteenth century, was, owing chiefly to his practice, raised to a height of reverence and devotion which it had rarely, if ever, attained before within the period with which this essay is concerned.[5]

---

[1] The Bishop was Dr. C. R. Sumner, also an Evangelical, who held the see 1827 to 1869.

[2] Dr. J. B. Sumner, an Evangelical, was Bishop of Chester, 1828-1848.

[3] *Diocesan Histories, Lichfield*, by W. Beresford, pp. 282-3.

[4] *Life of Bishop C. R. Sumner*, by G. H. Sumner (1876), pp. 215-220, for an account of the Bishop's confirmations.

---

[1] I have heard the story from the late Mr. George W. E. Russell, who had heard it from Mr. Gladstone. In 1909 an old man was still alive at Pocklington, in the East Riding, who had been thus confirmed by Archbishop Harcourt; he gave a like account to persons now living.

[2] Bishop S. Wilberforce (1805-1873) was Archdeacon of Surrey (1839-1845), Bishop of Oxford (1845-1869), and of Winchester (1869-1873).

With Bishop Samuel Wilberforce this study ends. The story of Confirmation, during the 350 years it attempts to cover, practically tells itself. The evidence shows the doubts and questions of the early period of the Reformation, the appeal to Scripture and to the Fathers which resulted, the strength of the Calvinist opposition which evoked the witness of Hooker, and the gradual recovery from Elizabethan neglect, marked by the Canons of 1603 and the practice of the bishops under Archbishop Laud. It shows the stand made in 1661; the minimizing doctrine which received strong support from the Revolution of 1688, and reached its height in the negations of Bishop Hoadly; the gradual lapse in practice from the Prayer Book standard during the later years of the eighteenth century down to the degradation of the confirmations in the diocese of Ely in the earlier decades of the nineteenth century. These tell their own tale; while, side by side with them, was the witness borne by the Nonjurors in England and in Scotland, and the clear belief of devout laymen in England and of bishops in the United States; the revival begun by the Evangelical Bishops of George IV's reign, which reached its height under Bishop Samuel Wilberforce,—all these are shown, by contemporary evidence. The witness to the doctrine is equally clear: at one time the objective, at another the subjective side of Confirmation is emphasized, but, though in some periods the pressure of belief in the subjective side seems to obscure, if not to obliterate, the objective, in fact this never happens: the truth always recovers its balance; attempts to deprive the bishop of the sole power of confirming fail; and the teaching that by the laying on of the bishop's hands a gift of the Holy Spirit is given appears as clearly in the nineteenth century as in the formularies of 1537 and 1540, three hundred years before.

---

[1] Burgon, *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, 2 vols. 3rd ed. (1889), ii. 25.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 26.

[3] Vol. i, p. 392 *q.*, *ibid.*

[4] i. 402, in a letter of 1847.

[5] *Cf.* Burgon, *op. cit.* ii. 28.

In the long debate the use of chrism almost disappears, and the personal responsibility of the candidate is strongly emphasized, but the fact that Confirmation is based on apostolic practice, that it is a means of grace, and that it is given by the imposition of the bishop's hands is made clear at each revision of the Prayer Book, and is witnessed to by teachers in each period. The strength of the criticism and the force of the attack, if they confused some minds, served to bring out the clear teaching for which the Church stands, and they have produced, in the writings of Richard Hooker, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, and of Herbert Thorndike, not to mention Hall and Hammond and William Law, works which are not the least among the treasures of the Church of England.

APPENDIX I

ARCHBISHOP HERRING'S VISITATION RETURNS, 1743

(Note to p. 198)

THE returns for this Visitation have been bound into four thick volumes and are among the MSS. of the Archbishop of York at Bishopthorpe.

I have examined in detail only the first two volumes.

Volume A contains the returns from 215 parishes, Volume B the returns from 208, so the evidence comes from 423 parishes.

In Question VII of his inquiries the Archbishop asked: "Do you know of any who come to Church in your Parish that are not Baptized? Or that being Baptized, and of a competent age, are not confirmed?"

In the vast majority of the replies the answer recurs: "I know of none such, save those that will be presented to your Grace for Confirmation at the present Visitation"; but in the case of the fifteen parishes printed below, answers were returned which show that the incumbent had admitted parishioners to Holy Communion without Confirmation and appeared to regard such admission as equivalent to it: admission to Holy Communion being equated with Confirmation.

The fifteen returns represent only twelve parish priests, for Brotherton and Ferry Fryston, Dunnington and Murton Chapel, and East Harsley and Ingleby Arncliffe were held in plurality. The replies are as follows:

1. *Kirk Deighton.* We have a few who have rec^d the Sacram^t before they could get an opportunity of being confirmed.
2. *Ingleby Arncliffe.* None of a competent age, but who are confirm'd or have frequently receiv'd y^e Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.
3. *East Harsley.* None of a competent age, but who are confirm'd, or have frequently receiv'd the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.
4. *Haltongill Chapel.* Some are not confirmed, but they have received the Communion.
5. *Felliskirk.* None of a competent age who are not confirmed or have received the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

6. *Felkirk.* Those of competent age, have either Receiv'd the Sacrament, or are brought now to be Confirmed.
7. *Brotherton.* The same reply as above.
8. *Ferry Fryston.* The same reply as above.
9. *Birkby.* The same reply as above.
10. *Dunnington.* None unconfirmed, excepting those that propose now to be Confirmed, and thoe (those) y^t^ have rec^d^ y^e^ Sacrament of y^e^ Lord's Supper.
11. *Colthorpe.* None excepting three old Persons who had received the Sacrament when I was inducted, and have frequently received it since.
12. *Acomb.* Those of competent age and not confirmed I have prepared . . . excepting those who have received the Sacrament.
13. *Lofthouse.* None, excepting those that now offer themselves, and a few others that have already received the Sacrament.
14. *Murton Chapel.* The same reply as above.
15. *Osset Chapel.* None; all Confirm'd, or have Received y^e^ Holy Sacram^t^, except Dissenters.

Confirmation had been very rarely administered in the diocese of York during the time of Archbishop Blackburne, as the facts given in Appendix II show.

APPENDIX II

CONFIRMATIONS IN THE DIOCESE OF YORK, 1737-1771

(Note to p. 199)

AMONG the MSS. of the Archbishop of York at Bishopthorpe are various letters and memoranda relation to Confirmations in the diocese during the episcopates of Archbishops Blackburne (1724-1743), Herring (1743-1747), Matthew Hutton II (1747-1757), Gilbert (1757-1761), and Drummond (1761-1776).

By the kindness of the present Archbishop I have been allowed to transcribe them and print extracts from them here. They are:

1. *A letter from Dr. Legh, Vicar of Halifax, to Dr. Hayter, Archdeacon of York, and Chaplain to Archbishop Blackburne.* The letter is dated 12 October 1737.

Dr. Legh writes:

"The Bishop of Gloucester is a man one would wish to spend a whole life with instead of two or three days. He confirm'd here and at Ripponden 8,922 or therabouts by only 2 at a time, with great devotion and solemnity. He was in Church from ab^{t}. 9 in y^{e} morning til near 7 at nights on y^{e} 10th and 11th of Sept. The consecration service at Ripponden on y^{e} 9th of y^{t} month began at 10 in y^{e} morning; ended abt. 12—after wh. he confirm'd abt. 1,500 there. The Churchwardens and Chapelwardens, who had each of ym a white staff, attended ye Confirmation. I took all ye Precautions I cd. to secure order at a time wh. I expected ye greatest want of it in this disorderly mob-situation. His L^{p} seem'd to be much pleas'd and said many good natured things to me."

2. *A letter from Archbishop Gilbert to the Bishop of St. Asaph (Drummond).*

"Bishopthorpe, 2d Aug^{t}, 1758.

My dear Lord,

According to yr. Lordship's desire, I send you a list of the parishes with the names of their respective ministers, who are ordered to attend at the places where your Lord^{p}. is so good as to undertake the fatigue of confirming.

With feet and ankles w^{ch} will hardly carry me over a plain floor I tremble to look at it: and think of it not without much concern for yr. Lord^{p}. I hope however I shal have the satisfaction to know yr. Lord^{p}. returns in as good health and spirits from your friendly labours, as I saw the Bp. of Clogher, who din'd here yesterday in his way to Chester, after confirming upwards of 15,000 in the East Riding."

3. *A reply to the above, from the Bishop of St. Asaph to Archbishop Gilbert.*

"Brodsworth,[1] Aug. 16th, 1758.

My dear Lord,

I have the satisfaction of informing your Grace that I finished the Confirmation last Monday so early as to get home in the evening from Sheffield. Every thing passed with great ease and order at all the places. The numbers, as far as we cd. count them, were these: viz.

at Doncaster (including those confirmed at Brodsworth) abt.	2,000
Wakefield	5,000
Leeds	5,000
Sheffield	3,000
	15,000

---

[1] Brodsworth was Dr. Drummond's seat in Yorkshire.

I don't believe there was a hundred difference more or less. I have some lists, but in the populous towns it was impossible to receive them.

The persons concerned in the different towns kept great order. The Constables and Churchwardens all attended and every thing was well conducted.

Your Grace will, I hope, find it very easy, in your triennial confirmations : and give me leave to hint to you that you make it still easier to yourself and others, if you would confirm at more places, as for example Hatfield as well as Doncaster, Sheffield—Rotherham and Barnsley, Wakefield—and Pontefract, Leeds—and Wetherby. Fewer numbers in a place and frequent confirmations will bring only the proper persons before you ; and bring all into a further sense of this reasonable institution."

Bishop Drummond soon had an opportunity of putting his good advice into practice, for he succeeded Archbishop Gilbert in 1761, and seems to have begun early to make plans for confirmations, as the two documents which follow show.

4. The first of them is a note about previous Confirmations from His Grace's Registrar, R. Mackley. It is headed :

" *List of Confirmations to the best of R. Mackley's memory*, 1761.

"York and Skipton by Ab. in 1748. [The Archbishop being Matthew Hutton II.]

At Halifax, by bp. of Chester in 1752 or 3.

At Sheffield, Donc., Wakefield, Leeds by present Ab. in 1755.

At Burrowbridge for Ripon and its neighbourhood by the Bp. of Chester in 1760.

At Hornsey, Hull, Beverley, Bridlington, Weighton by the Bp. of Clogher in 1758.

At Nottingham, Newark and Retford by Ab. in 1759. [The Archbishop being Dr. Gilbert.]

At Stokesley by Ab. in 1749. [Archbishop M. Hutton.]

At Thirsk and Malton by Ab. in 1760. [Archbishop Gilbert.]

At Hexham by Bp. of Dm. in 1760."

The Registrar's memory was imperfect, for from the correspondence above and which follows it is clear that he misdated by three years the Confirmations by Dr. Drummond, then Bishop of St. Asaph, and by Dr. Keene, Bishop of Chester. Archbishop Drummond consulted not only his Registrar, but also the Vicar of Halifax, Dr. Legh, an extract from whose letter to Archdeacon Hayter appears above. Dr. Legh's letter shows how well, on the whole, he remembered the events of twenty-four years before.

5. *Extract from a letter from Dr. Legh,*[1] *Vicar of Halifax,*[1] *to Archbishop Drummond* (dated " Dec. 22, 1761 ").

Having explained that he writes to rectify an account of the latest Confirmations at Halifax which recently he had given to His Grace verbally, Dr. Legh writes, "After ye Diocesan's 20 years absence, y^e^ only Confirm^n^ here in Archbp. Blackburne's time was :

A.D. 1737, Septr. 10, 11, 12, 13 by his Grace's Representative, Bp. Benson, number of ye Confirm'd abt. 9,000. The only ones since his time were the 3 following, viz. :

In	1744, Jan. 5, 6, 7, by Archbp. Herring, number Confd.	4,000
	1747, In May, 2 or 3 days, by do. . . .	No. 3,000
	1755, Oct. 14, 15, 16, by Bp. Keene for Archbp. Hutton	No. 3,500

In 1737 my then newly rebuilt chapel at Ripponden abt. 5 miles off was consecrated, and afterwards several children were confirm'd there.

Halifax Vicarage alone having under ye mother church 12 chapels consecrated (and a 13th as yet unendowed and unconsecrated) containing ab^t^. 40,000 people, on such occasions creates much work to ye diocesan : which at ye times above mentioned was greatly increas'd by ye candidates from neighbouring parishes, viz.

From these 7 *unexpectedly* (each at 6 or 7 computed miles from it) Bradford, Birstall, Batley, Kirkheaton, Bingley, Huddersfield Sole and Almondbury. And from these 4, and others, *unexpectedly*, each more remote than the former, Calverley, Emley, Ottley and Mirfield."

Dr. Legh adds that he has been used to get a golden guinea changed into silver pennies by a former Lord Almoner. He reminds the Archbishop of this because of " ye approaching Confirmation, which brings a number of little folks to be catechiz'd and to deserve these little incouragements from their vicar towards some of them wñ such an exchange is procurable by an inferior.[2]

' Pueris dant crustula blandi
Doctores, elementa velint ut discere prima.' "

---

[1] George Legh, LL.D., was Vicar of Halifax from 1731 till he died in 1775. Dr. Whitaker describes him as " as a low churchman and popular among the dissenters, a disciple of Bishop Hoadly. . . . His duty as a preacher . . . he is said to have performed in a very languid and careless manner."—*Loidis and Elmete* (1816), pp. 385-6.

[2] Archbishop Drummond had been made Lord High Almoner by George III at the beginning of his reign.

6. Archbishop Drummond made notes of the various Visitations held immediately before his time and of the numbers of candidates he confirmed, as follows:

"*The last archiepiscopal visitations in diocese of York. From Mr. Mackley*, 1763.

For Archdeaconry of York at Rotherham, Donc., Wakefield, Skipton, Leeds, York and Ripon in May and July 1748.

For Archdy. E.R. at Beverley, Hull and Bridlington, May and June 1749.

For Archdy. Nottingham, Newark and Retford, Sept. 1759.

For Archdy. of Cleveland at Stokesley, Thirsk and Malton, Sept. 1760.

The Archbishop uses and distributes a little tract on Confirmation by Dr. Worthington, which he got printed.

Numbers confirmed dioc. York 1762-3 primary confirm^{n} 27,500 and probably more and in 1764 500 at Hexham.

All Ss. Pavement 71—199 families.

S. M. Spurr. 54[1]—150 families."

Archbishop Drummond noted his later Confirmations, thus:

"*Confirmations in the diocese of York by R. Ebor.*

No. [i.e. numbers] age from 15 to 22.

1768, Septr.	5th.	Leeds	1,850
	6th.	Bradford	435
	7th.	Halifax	1,200
	8th.	Wakefield	2,442
	10th.	Doncaster	1,430
	11th.	Brodsworth and Marr parishes only	46
	12th.	Barnsley	1,600
	13th.	Rotherham	2,070
	14th.	Harthill	530
	16th.	Worksop	504
	19th.	Pontefract	1,760
	20th.	York for the City parishes	1,450
	21st.	Tadcaster	1,210
	22nd.	York for the adjacent parishes	1,250
			17,777

---

[1] All Saints, Pavement, and St. Michael's, Spurrier Gate, parishes in the City of York.

In 1763, 15,827. Increase in the same parishes 1,950.

1769, June	12.	Nottingham	3,600
	14.	Mansfield	933
	15.	Southwell	1,050
	16.	Newark	1,320
	17.	Retford	1,520
			8,423
		In 1763	3,957
			4,466 increase.

1770, July	19.	Skipton	2,600
	23.	Ripon	1,300
	25.	Thirsk	1,900
Aug.	8.	Beverley	1,800
	10.	Hull	2,000
	14.	Malton	1,800
	16.	Scarborough	1,900
			13,300
		1763	5,896
			7,404 increase.

Total increase 1768/70 — 13,820.
Total 1768-70, 39,500.
Stokesley is omitted, the Church being not yet repaired.
Stokesley in 1771, 2,100. Total 41,600."
The Archbishop adds :
" 1762-3. Confirmation.
1764. Visitation.
1768-9. Confirmation.
1770-1. Visitation."

The figures and dates recorded show Archbishop Drummond to have been more active than some of his predecessors, for in the nine years 1762-1771 he confirmed in person throughout his large diocese twice, which though not as high as the standard ordered by the Canon, viz. once every three years, was at least a marked improvement.

Archbishop Herring, during his short reign (4 years), appears to have adhered conscientiously to the canonical rule ; while Archbishop Gilbert, who was a sick man, managed to secure a Confirmation for all parts of his diocese except Halifax and its district, during his four years. The following table arranges the facts in chronological order.

(1) 1737. Halifax 10-13 Septr. West Riding. Bp. of Gloucester for Abp. Blackburne.
(2) 1743, 4. East, West and North Ridings. Abp. Herring.
(3) 1747. Halifax. West Riding (probably the other two). Abp. Herring.
(4) 1748. York and Skipton. North Riding. Abp. Hutton.
(5) 1749. Stokesley. North Riding. Abp. Hutton.
(6) 1755. Halifax. West Riding. Bp. of Chester for Abp. Hutton.
(7) 1758. Sheffield, Doncaster, Wakefield, Leeds. West Riding. Bp. of St. Asaph for Abp. Gilbert.
Hornsea, Beverley, Hull, Bridlington and Weighton. East Riding. Bp. of Clogher for Abp. Gilbert.
(8) 1759. Nottingham, Newark and Retford. Notts. Abp. Gilbert.
(9) 1760. Thirsk and Malton. North Riding. Abp. Gilbert.
Boroughbridge for Ripon. North Riding. Bp. of Chester for Abp. Gilbert.
Hexham. Hexhamshire. Bp. of Durham for Abp. Gilbert.
(10) 1762, 3, 4. North, East and West Ridings, Notts. and Hexhamshire. Abp. Drummond.
(11) 1768. Leeds, Wakefield, etc. West Riding. Abp. Drummond.
(12) 1769. Nottingham, etc. Notts. Abp. Drummond.
(13) 1770. Skipton, Beverley, etc. North and East Ridings. Abp. Drummond.
(14) 1771. Stokesley. North Riding. Abp. Drummond.

APPENDIX III

EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ORDERS OF CONFIRMATION WITH CONSIGNATION AND CHRISM

(Note to pp. 202–207)

1. The Office of the English Nonjurors issued in 1718, transcribed from a copy of *A Communion Office, etc.* London. Printed for James Bettenham at the Crown in Pater-noster Row. MDCCXVIII. The copy I have used is in the library of the Dean and Chapter of York.

THE ORDER OF CONFIRMATION
or
LAYING ON OF HANDS UPON THOSE THAT ARE BAPTIZED.

Upon the day appointed, all that are to be then confirmed, being placed, and standing in order before the Bishop; he, or some Priest appointed by him, shall read this Preface following.

To the end that Confirmation may be ministred to the more edifying of such as shall receive it, the Church hath thought good to order, that none hereafter shall be confirmed, but such as can say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the ten Commandments, and can also answer to such other questions, as in the short Catechism are contained. Which order is very convenient to be observed, to the end that children, being now come to the years of discretion, and having learned what their Godfathers and Godmothers promised for them in Baptism, they may themselves, with their own mouth and consent, openly before the Church ratify and confirm the same; and also promise, that by the grace of God they will evermore endeavour themselves faithfully to observe such things, as they by their own confession have assented unto.

Then shall the Bishop say to those who are to be confirmed,

Do ye here, in the presence of God and of this Congregation, renew the solemn promise and vow that was made in your Name at your Baptism; ratifying and confirming the same in your own persons, and acknowledging yourselves bound to believe and to do all those things, which your Godfathers and Godmothers then undertook for you?

And every one shall audibly answer,

I do.

The Bishop.

Our help is in the Name of the Lord;

Answer.

Who hath made heaven and earth.

Bishop.

Blessed be the name of the Lord;

Answer.

Henceforth world without end.

Bishop.

The Lord be with you.

Answer.

And with thy spirit.

Bishop.

Let us pray.

Here all shall kneel down, except the Bishop, who shall proceed, saying,

Almighty and everliving God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy servants by water and the Holy Ghost, and hast thereby given unto them forgiveness of all their sins; Send down from heaven, we beseech thee, O Lord, thine Holy Ghost the Comforter upon them; and daily increase in them thy manifold gifts of grace, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and ghostly strength, the spirit of knowledge and true godliness, and fill them with the spirit of thy holy fear now and ever. Sign them, O Lord, and mark them to be thine for ever, by the vertue of thy holy Cross and Passion. Mercifully confirm and strengthen them with the inward unction of thy Holy Ghost unto everlasting life. Amen.

Then all of them kneeling in order before the Bishop, he shall anoint every one of them with the Chrism or Ointment, making the sign of the Cross upon their forehead, and saying,

N. I sign thee with the sign of the Cross, I anoint thee with Holy Ointment.

Then the Bishop shall lay his hand upon the head of the Person he is confirming, and say,

And I lay my hand upon thee: In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

And the Bishop keeping his hand still upon the person's head, shall say,

Defend, O Lord, this thy child (or *this thy servant*) with thy heavenly grace, that *he* may continue thine for ever, and daily increase in thy Holy Spirit more and more, until *he* come unto thine everlasting kingdom. Amen.

And thus shall the Bishop do to every person that is to be confirmed, one after another; and then he shall say,

The peace of the Lord be always with you.

Answer.

And with thy spirit.

Bishop.

Let us pray.

And all kneeling down, except the Bishop, he shall say the Lord's Prayer and the two collects following.

Our Father, which art in heaven; Hallowed be thy Name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation; But deliver us from evil. Amen.

Almighty and everlasting God, who makest us both to will and to do those things, which are good and acceptable unto thy Divine Majesty; We make our humble supplications unto thee for these thy servants, upon whom (after the example of thy Holy Apostles) we have now laid our hands, to certify them (by this sign) of thy favour and gracious goodness towards them. Let thy fatherly hand, we beseech thee, ever be over them; let thy Holy Spirit ever be with them; and so lead them in the knowledge and obedience of thy word, that in the end they may obtain everlasting life, through our Lord Jesus Christ; who, with Thee and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth ever one God, world without end. Amen.

O Almighty Lord and everlasting God, vouchsafe, we beseech thee, to direct, sanctify, and govern both our hearts and bodies in the ways of thy laws and in the works of thy commandments; that through thy most mighty protection, both here and ever, we may be preserved in body and soul, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

Then the Bishop shall bless them, saying thus,

The blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be upon you, and remain with you for ever. Amen.

When any Persons are confirmed, who were of riper years when they were baptized, and so answered for themselves; then the Preface at the beginning of this Office, and the Question which follows it, shall both be omitted; and the Bishop shall begin with, "Our help is in the Name of the Lord."

And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion, until such time as he be confirmed.

Before the Bishop begins the Office of Confirmation, he shall take some Chrism or Ointment; and putting it into a decent Vessel, he shall stand and consecrate it in manner and form following, unless he hath some by him already consecrated.

Bishop.

The Lord be with you.

Answer.

And with thy spirit.

Bishop.

Let us pray.

And the People kneeling, the Bishop shall say,

O Lord of mercies, and Father of lights, from whom every good and perfect gift proceedeth; Send down, we beseech thee, thine Holy Spirit to sanctify this Ointment: And grant, that all those who after Baptism shall be anointed therewith, may be cleansed and purified both in body and soul, be confirmed in godliness, and obtain the blessings of the Holy Ghost; who, with the Father and the Son, liveth and reigneth ever one God, world without end. Amen.

Then the People shall stand up, and the Bishop shall proceed to the Office.

The Matter of the Chrism or Ointment for Confirmation is sweet Oil of Olives, and precious Balsam commonly called Balm of Gilead.

2. Order of Confirmation and Form for Consecrating the Chrism used by Bishop John Falconar (consecrated 1709, died 1723).

These MSS. are among those preserved in the Episcopal Chest at Edinburgh, where they are numbered 1018 and 1021 respectively. I have to thank the Most Rev. the Primus and the Right Revs. the Bishops of the Church in Scotland for their kind permission to print them and the MS. which follows them. Each of the two MSS. is endorsed by Robert Forbes (1708-1775), Bishop of Ross:

"This is in the hand-writing of Bp. John Falconar."

OFFICE OF CONFIRMATION

[Described in Catalogue 1018, Confirmation Office for Bp. J. Falconar.]

Almighty and everliving God Who hath vouchsafed to sanctifie this thy servant by the Laver of Baptism and hast given unto him the forgiveness of all his sins. Strengthen him we beseech, O Lord with thy H. Ghost the Comforter and daily encrease in him thy manifold gifts of Grace, the Spirit of Wisdom and Understanding the Spirit of Counsel and Ghostly Strength the Spirit of knowledge and true godlieness and fullfill him O Lord with the Spirit of thy Holy fear. Sign him and mark him to be thine for ever by the vertue of thy Holy Cross and passion. Confirm and Strengthen him with the inward Unction of thy Holy Spirit unto Life everlasting. Amen.

I sign the with this sign with the sign of ✠ Cross, and Confirm the with the Chrism of Salvation, and lay mine hands upon thee in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the H. Ghost. Amen.

And continuing his Hand on his Head,

Defend O Lord this thy servant with thy Heavenly Grace that he may Continue thine for ever, and daylie encrease in thy Holy Spirit more and more untill he come to thine everlasting Kingdom. Amen.

FORM FOR CONSECRATING THE CHRISM

O God the Father of Lights from Whom Cometh every good and perfect Gift send forth thy most holy Spirit on this oil : make it the oil of Gladnes to the sanctifieing of the soul and Body the Garment of Incorruption and a perfecting seal Imprinting the Holy Name of thy only Begotten Son, and Holy Spirit on this thy servant now hallowed by the water of Baptism, that he being thus sanctified in soul and Body and free'd from the dominion of all sin and wickedness may be safe from the temptations and Infestments of all evill and impure Spirits and being numbered among thy sons and adopted into thy family—he may be owned by thee before thy saints angels and archangels and in and by this pure and sacred Mystery the Holy Ghost the Spirit of Jesus Christ may enter into him—and ever dwell within him as in ane Holy Temple through the same our Lord Jesus Christ to Whom with thee O Father and the Holy Ghost be all Honor and Glory now and evermore. Amen.

3. Order of Confirmation and Form for Consecrating the Chrism used by Thomas Rattray, Bishop of Dunkeld (1684-1743).

Thomas Rattray was consecrated in 1727, and was Primus from 1739 till his death.

The MS. from which the Order and the Form are transcribed is No. 1044 of the MSS. in the Episcopal Chest. The Order of Confirmation follows closely the Office of 1718 above.

"THE ORDER OF CONFIRMATION

or

"CHRISM AND "LAYING ON OF HANDS UPON THOSE THAT ARE BAPTIZED."

//fol. 1.

"They that are to be Confirmed being placed in order before the Bishop, he shall say

Our help is in the Name of the Lord.

Answer.

Who hath made heaven and Earth.

Bishop.

Blessed be the Name of the Lord.

Answer.

Henceforth world without end.

Bp.

The Lord be with you.

Ans.

And with thy Spirit.

Bp.

Let us pray.

" Here all shall kneel down, except the Bishop, who shall proceed, saying,"

Almighty and Everliving God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy Servants by the Water of Baptism ; Send down from Heaven, we beseech thee, thine Holy Ghost the//[1] Comforter upon them ; and dayly Increase in them thy manifold Gifts of Grace the Spirit of Wisdom & Understanding, the Spirit of Counsel and Ghostly Strength, The Spirit of Knowlege and true Godliness, and fill them with the Spirit of thy holy Fear. Sign them, O Lord, and mark " them to be thine for ever by the virtue of thy holy Cross & passion. " Mercifully Confirm and strengthen them with the inward Unction " of they holy Ghost unto everlasting Life. Amen.

" Then shall the Bp. anoint every one severally with the Chrism, making the Sign of the Cross upon his Forehead, and saying,

" *N.* I sign thee with the Sign of the Cross, anoynt thee with holy Ointment,"

Then laying his hands upon the head of the " person he is confirming,

"And I lay my hands upon thee : In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Amen.

And keeping his Hands still upon the Person's head, he shall say,

Child

Seal this thy Servant, O Lord, with the Gift of thy holy Spirit, that He may be thine for ever, and dayly increase in the same more and more, untill he come unto thine everlasting Kingdom. Amen.

[2] And thus shall the Bishop do to every person that is to be Confirmed, one after another ; And then he shall say,

" The peace of the Lord be always with you.

Ans.

And with thy Spirit.

Bp.

Let us pray.

" Our Father which art in heaven ; Hallowed be thy Name. Thy " Kingdom come. Thy will be done in Earth as it is in heaven. " Give us this day our dayly Bread. And forgive us our Trespasses, " as we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into " Temptation ; But deliver us from Evil. Amen."

---

[1] //fol. 1 *d*. [2] //fol. 2.

Almighty and Everliving God, who makest us both to will and to do those things that are good and acceptable unto thy Divine Majesty; We make our humble Supplications unto thee for these thy Servants, upon whom (after the Example of thy holy Apostles) we have now laid our hands. Let thy fatherly Hand, we beseech thee, ever be over them; Let thy holy Spirit ever be with them; and so lead them in the Knowledge and Obedience of thy word that[1] in the end they may obtain everlasting Life through our Lord Jesus Christ; who, with Thee and the holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth ever one God, world without end. Amen.

" O Almighty Lord and Everlasting God, vouchsafe we beseech " thee to direct sanctifye and Govern both our hearts and bodies " in the ways of thy Laws and in the works of thy Commandments; " that through thy most mighty protection, both here and ever, we " may be preserved in Body & Soul, through our Lord and Saviour " Jesus Christ. Amen.

Then the Bp. shall bless them, saying thus,

The Blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be upon you, & remain with you for ever. Amen.

" When any of the persons to be Confirmed (having been baptized " in Infancy) are come to the years of Discretion, and have " learn'd what their Godfathers & Godmothers promised for " them in Baptism; it is very convenient that, on this solemn " Occasion, they should themselves, openly before the Church, " renew & ratifye the same, and also promise, that by the " Grace of God they will evermore Endeavour faithfully to " observe such things as they by their own Confession have " assented unto: The Bishop therefore shall first say unto them[2]

" Do ye here, in the presence of God and of this Congregation, " renew the solemn promise and Vow that was made in your name " at your Baptism; Ratifying the same in your own persons and " acknowledging yourselves bound to believe and to do all those " things which your [Parents] Godfathers [Sponsors][3] and God-" mothers then undertook for you?

" And every one of them shall audibly answer,

" I do.

" Then the Bishop shall proceed to the Office of Confirmation as " above."

---

[1] fol. 2 *d.*

[2] fol. 3.

[3] " Parents " and " Sponsors " are in another hand, and " Sponsors " is in the margin.

"THE FORM OF CONSECRATING THE CHRISM"

"The matter of the Chrism or Ointment for Confirmation,
" is sweet oyl of Olives, and precious Balsam, commonly called Balm
" of Gilead. And if the Bishop hath none of it by him already
" consecrated, then putting some of it into a decent Vessel, he shall
" stand and consecrate it in manner and Form following before he
" begins the Office,

" Bp.
" The Lord be with you.
" Ans.
" And with thy Spirit.
Bishop.
[1] " Let us pray.

"And the people kneeling the Bp. shall say

" O Lord of Mercies and Father of Lights, from whom every
" good and perfect Gift proceedeth ; Send down we beseech thee,
" thy holy Spirit to sanctifye this Ointment : Make it the Oyl of
" Gladness, a Garment of Incorruption, and a perfecting Seal,
" imprinting the Divine Image of thy only begotten Son upon thy
" Servants who have been Regenerated by the Laver of Baptism ;
" That by this sacred Mystery, the holy Ghost, the Spirit of Jesus
" may descend upon and enliven these His Members, who shall be
" anointed therewith, and may dwell in them for ever, as in an holy
" Temple ; That they being sanctifyed both in Body and Soul,
" may be safe from the Temptations and Infestments of all evil
" and impure Spirits, freed from the Dominion of all sin and Wicked-
" ness, and Confirmed in Godlyness ; And being ever led by the
" Spirit, and bringing forth the Fruits thereof may be owned by
" thee as thy Children before thy holy Angels, and admitted to a
" participation of the Inheritance of the Saints in Light, Through
" Jesus Christ our Lord, who with thee, O Father, liveth and
" Reigneth in the unity of the same Spirit, one God, world without
" end. Amen."

In another hand is written :

[2] N.B. In a Copy of this office in the Author's own Handwriting the confirming Sentence runs thus :

N. I seal thee with the Seal of the Cross : ✠. I anoint with holy Ointment, as an Emblem of the inward Unction of the Holy Spirit. And, I lay my Hands upon thee ; In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. (Then follows) :

---

[1] fol. 3 *d.*

[2] fo. 4.

Defend, O Lord, this thy Child (or Servant) etc., as in the Common-prayer.

(Then the Bishop shall say):

O Lord God who are unbegotten and wt.out [*i.e.* without] Superior, Thou Lord of all, who hast made the Sweet Savour of the Knowledge of the Gospel to go forth among all Nations ; Do thou now grant that this Chrism may be effectual, in these baptised Children (or Persons) that the sweet Savour of thy Christ may remain firm and stable in them ; and that they dying with him in his Death, may rise again with him in his Resurrection, and live together with him ; by whom and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all Honour and Glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, World without End. Amen.

Bishop. The Peace of the Lord be always with you.
Answer. And with thy Spirit.
Bishop. Let us pray.
Our Father, etc., as above.

4. Order of Confirmation from the *Compleat Collection of Devotions*,[1] London, 1734, by the Nonjuror Bishop Thomas Deacon (1697-1753). It was used, apparently, by the Non-usager section of the Nonjurors, over whom Deacon and his successors presided, until the last bishop of the line died in 1805. The forms are on pp. 134-140.

THE ORDER OF CONFIRMATION

or

LAYING ON OF HANDS UPON THOSE THAT ARE BAPTIZED

At the time appointed, all that are to be then confirmed, being placed, the Adults and the Sponsors with the children in their arms standing in order before the Bishop, he shall begin the office thus :

Bishop. Our help is in the name of the Lord ;
Answer. Who hath made heaven and earth.
Bishop. Blessed be the name of the Lord :
Answer. Henceforth world without end.
Bishop. The Lord be with you.
Answer. And with thy spirit.

---

[1] On the *Compleat Devotions* see H. Broxap's *Thomas Deacon* (1911), pp. 172-176, and the same writer's *The Later Nonjurors* (1924).

Then shall the Deacon say to the People,

Let us pray.

Here all shall kneel down except the Bishop, who shall proceed, saying :

Almighty and everliving God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy servants by Water and the Holy Ghost, and hast thereby given unto them remission of all their sins : Send down from heaven, we beseech thee, O Lord, thine Holy Ghost the Comforter upon them, and daily increase in them thy manifold gifts of grace, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and ghostly strength, and the spirit of knowledge and true godliness, and fill them with the spirit of thy holy fear now and ever. Sign them O Lord and mark them to be thine for ever, by the virtue of thy beloved Son's holy cross and passion. Mercifully confirm and strengthen them with the inward unction of thy Holy Ghost unto everlasting life. *Amen.*

Then the People rising, and the Adults to be confirmed and the Sponsors with the children in their arms, kneeling in order before the Bishop (though it be Sunday or between Easter and Pentecost), he shall anoint them severally with the Holy Chrism or Ointment, making the sign of the cross upon their foreheads, and saying, N. the servant of God is sealed with the seal of the Cross, and anointed with Holy Ointment, as an emblem of the inward unction of the Holy Spirit. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. *Amen.*

Then the Bishop shall lay his hands upon the person's head, and say,

Defend, O Lord, this thy child [*or* this thy servant] with thy heavenly grace, that *he* may continue thine for ever, and daily increase in thy Holy Spirit more and more, until *he* come to thine everlasting kingdom. *Amen.*

And thus shall the Bishop do to every person that is to be confirmed, one after another ; after which done, the Deacon shall turn to the People and say,

Let us attend.

Then shall the Bishop say the following prayer.

O Lord God, who art unbegotten and without superior ; thou Lord of all, who hast made the sweet savour of the knowledge of the Gospel to go forth among all nations : Do thou now grant that this Chrism may be effectual in these baptized children [*or* persons] that the sweet savour of thy Christ may remain firm and stable in them, and that they dying with him in his death, may rise again with him in his resurrection, and live together with him ; by whom and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto Thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. *Amen.*

Then shall the Bishop say to the People,

The peace of the Lord be always with you.

Answer. And with thy spirit.

Then shall the Deacon say to the People,

Let us pray.

And all kneeling down, except the Bishop, he shall say the Lord's prayer, the People repeating it after him.

Our Father, who art in heaven ; Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation ; But deliver us from the evil one. For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. *Amen.*

Then shall the Bishop say the following prayer :

Almighty and everlasting God, who makest us both to will and to do those things, which are good and acceptable unto thy divine majesty : We make our humble supplications unto thee for these thy servants, upon whom (after the example of thy holy apostles) we have now laid our hands, as a sure token of thy favour and goodness towards them. Let thy fatherly hand, we beseech thee, ever be over them ; let thy Holy Spirit ever be with them ; and so lead them in the knowledge and obedience of thy word, that in the end they may obtain everlasting life, through our Lord Jesus Christ ; who with Thee and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth ever one God, world without end. *Amen.*

Then shall the Bishop bless them, saying thus,

The Blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be upon you, and remain with you for ever. *Amen.*

Note, that if a child's Sponsor at Baptism die before it be confirmed, or be sick at the time of Confirmation, or through any other urgent cause cannot be present at the Confirmation ; then some other proper person shall hold the child, and be a witness of its Confirmation.

Note, that they who through necessity have received private Baptism and have been anointed with the holy Chrism by a Priest, shall be confirmed by themselves ; in which case the Bishop shall use the foregoing office, except that he shall omit the anointing and the sign of the cross, and shall only lay his hands upon every one to be confirmed, and say, Defend, O Lord, this thy child [*or* this thy servant] with thy heavenly grace, that *he* may continue thine for ever, and daily increase in thy Holy Spirit more and more, until *he* come to thine everlasting kingdom. *Amen.*

Then shall the Deacon say to the People,

Let us attend.

Then shall the Bishop say to the People,

The peace of the Lord, etc., *and so proceed as before appointed.*

THE FORM OF CONSECRATING THE CHRISM FOR CONFIRMATION

When the Chrism for Confirmation is to be consecrated, the Deacon immediately after the Nicene Creed in the Eucharistick Service, shall bring a proper quantity of Chrism or Ointment (made of sweet Oil of Olives and precious Balsam commonly called Balm of Gilead) in a decent vessel to the Bishop, who shall place it upon the Altar ; and then turning to the People, he shall say,

The Lord be with you.

Answ. And with thy spirit.

Then shall the Deacon say to the People,

Let us pray.

Then the People shall kneel down ; and the Bishop turning to the Altar, and standing before it, shall say the following prayer.

We give thanks to thee, O God, the creator of the universe, both for the fragrancy of the ointment, and for the immortality which thou hast revealed unto us by thy Son Jesus : Do thou now, O Lord of mercies and Father of lights, from whom every good and perfect gift proceedeth, send down thine Holy Spirit to sanc✠tify *Here the Bishop is to make the sign of the cross over the Chrism* this Ointment : And grant, that all those who after baptism shall be anointed therewith, may be cleansed and purified both in body and soul, may be confirmed in godliness, and may obtain the blessings of the Holy Ghost ; who, with the Father and the Son, liveth and reigneth, ever one God, world without end. *Amen.*

Then the People shall rise, and the Deacon shall carry the consecrated Chrism into the Vestry, or to some other convenient place.

Note, every Priest must take care to apply to the Bishop for consecrated Chrism, who shall upon such their application furnish them therewith.

APPENDIX IV

A LIST OF SOME ANGLICAN WORKS ON CONFIRMATION

1. *Χειροθεσία*, or the Apostolique Institution of Imposition of Hands for Confirmation Revived by a Lover of Peace and Truth. London, 1649.

   The author was Dr. Joseph Hall, Bishop of Norwich, and the monograph is reprinted in his *Works*.

2. *Τελείωσις*, or an Exercitation upon Confirmation, by Jonathan Hanmer, Vicar of Instow. 1657, 2nd ed. 1658.

   Hanmer was, though an English priest, a Congregationalist and became a Non-Conformist in 1662. His book was a plea for a revival of a form of Confirmation.

3. *Confirmation or Restauration, etc.*, by Richard Baxter. 1658; and reprinted in Orme's edition of Baxter's *Practical Works*, 1830, vol. xiv, pp. 401-594.

   Baxter's original aim was to support Hanmer's plea by fuller scriptural references.

4. *De Confirmatione*, by Dr. Henry Hammond, Archdeacon of Chichester and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. 1661. With an Introduction by Dr. Henchman, Bishop of Salisbury.

   Reprinted, without the Introduction, in the folio edition of Hammond's *Works*, 1674. Vol. iii, pp. 861-895.

5. *Χρῖσις Τελειωτική: a Discourse of Confirmation*, by Dr. Jeremy Taylor, Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore. 1663. Reprinted in his *Works*, ed. Heber, vol. xi, pp. 215-297, in his *Works*, ed. Eden.

6. *'Ενιαυτός, or a Course of Catechizing.* London, 1664. 2nd ed., enlarged and illustrated, 1674.

7. *Of Episcopal Confirmation, in Two Discourses*, by B. Canfield, Rector of Aylestone. London, 1682.

8. *Confirmation of Divine Original*, by Dr. George Hickes, then Dean of Worcester. In form this is a sermon, preached before 1688; in fact it is a short monograph, to a great extent reproducing Bishop J. Taylor's work. Published in *A Volume of Posthumous Discourses*, by the late Dr. Hickes, ed. N. Spinckes, London, 1726.

9. *The Divine Original of Confirmation*, by Samuel Saywell, B.D., Rector of Bluntisham. 1701. This is a Visitation Sermon expanded.

10. *The Great Duty of Frequenting the Christian Sacrifice, etc.*, to

which is prefixed *Instructions for Confirmation*, by Robert Nelson. Published in 1706 and constantly reprinted.

11. *Three Practical Essays on Baptism, Confirmation and Repentance*, by Samuel Clarke. 1699.

    The author was famous later as a distinguished Latitudinarian divine. The greater part of the book is concerned with Confirmation.

12. *A Lecture on Confirmation*, by Dr. Thomas Secker, Archbishop of Canterbury, written apparently at some date soon after 1735. Published first in 1769 and reprinted in his *Works*, ed. 1811, vol. vi, pp. 399-416.

13. *A Solemn Appeal to the Right Reverend the Bishop and to the Reverend the Clergy of the Diocese of Ely*, etc., by the Rev. William Cecil. Cambridge, 1833.

    Besides its historical account of confirmations at Cambridge in 1825 and 1833, this contains an Appendix of Instructions in preparation for Confirmation.

14. *The Order of Confirmation illustrated by Select Passages from Old English Divines with Lessons, Prayers, and Meditations: and a History of Confirmation*, by the Rev. Henry Hopwood, M.A., Rector of Bothal, Northumberland. London, J. H. Parker, 1848.

    This little book is the first attempt to give a history of the doctrine and practice of Confirmation in England, and though it is on a very small scale is of considerable interest. It went into a third edition in 1848.

15. *The History of Confirmation*, by William Jackson, M.A., Queen's College, Oxford; Vicar of Heathfield, Sussex. Oxford and London, James Parker & Co., 1877.

    This deals with the history both of the doctrine and the practice throughout the Church from the earliest times, and contains the result of much valuable research compressed into a very small compass.

16. *Confirmation*, by the Right Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., Bishop of Vermont.

    In the *Oxford Library of Practical Theology* series. It deals with the whole history of Confirmation in the Church, and is the only work which treats of the divines of the Church in the U.S.A.

17. *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, by A. J. Mason, D.D., Canon of Canterbury, 1891.

    A very complete study of this aspect of the doctrine of Confirmation, and of great value for its research, especially into patristic sources.

CHAPTER IV

CONFIRMATION RITES

By C. L. Feltoe

SUMMARY

I. General.
II. The English Rite.
III. Protestant Usages.
IV. Appendix: Some Typical Rites.

I. General

In treating of this part of the subject we shall no doubt often have to refer to matters which are dealt with by other contributors to the volume from different points of view. Our object here, however, will be to refer to them as elucidating the development of the rite itself or the variations which have occurred in it in divers places and at divers periods, rather than in regard to their doctrinal significance or their origin and rationale. Our aim will be first to describe as best we can the general character and the details of the Rite in both East and West up to the middle of the sixteenth century, when the great change was made in it for the Anglican Communion; and then to describe that change itself, to discuss the changes which have been made or proposed in it at the present time by our own and other branches of the Anglican Communion: and lastly to indicate what are the main features of the rite in the chief Reformed Churches of the Continent.

If we except the doubtful but generally accepted reference of the expression "laying on of hands" (*ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν*) in Heb. vi. 1 to Confirmation (the date of which is uncertain[1]), the first indication in the Holy Scripture of the nature of the rite is the well-known passage, Acts

---

[1] It is, however, not at all likely to be earlier than St. Luke's writing of the "Acts of Apostles."

viii. 14 ff. There we read that before the Apostles Peter and John laid their hands on those Samaritans who had been baptized, they "prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost." And that natural preliminary was no doubt constantly observed at least by the Apostles and their immediate successors in all normal cases, though it is not actually mentioned in Acts xix. 1 ff., when St. Paul administered the rite at Ephesus.

In both these instances found in the Acts (as well as in Heb. vi. i and 2 Tim. i. 6,[1] if we are justified in including them) the expression imposition (or laying on) of hands (pl.) not hand (sing.) is used, though the singular was much more common, if not almost universal, afterwards; for though in the former instance (vv. 17 and 18) the plural might be taken to refer to the two Apostles' hands who confirmed, yet immediately afterwards Simon (v. 19) still uses the plural of himself alone ("on whomsoever I lay my hands"). See further on this point pp. 253 f.

When unction was introduced into the rite is uncertain. Dr. Chase[2] has argued in favour of its having been actually the apostolic practice (pp. 56 ff.), but such scriptural terms as σφραγίζειν and χρίειν of the Holy Spirit may be only metaphorical, and do not for certain refer to Confirmation. Nevertheless, the practice is fairly early: for instance, Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* i. 21, § 3 (*c.* 175-190) attributes it to the Marcosians, an early body of heretics who are more likely to have copied it from the Christians than vice versa: Theophilus of Antioch (*c.* 180), Tertullian at Carthage, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Sarapion in Egypt, and the *Apostolic Constitutions* all bear witness to its use likewise.

In Eastern Syria among the Syriac-speaking Churches, and probably in Armenia, the gift of the Holy Spirit was at first associated with a pre-baptismal unction (whether with simple oil or prepared chrism) and this may be taken to be equivalent to Confirmation as practised elsewhere, especially in the West. It is possible that this practice may be traced to (*a*) the account given in Acts ix. 10 ff. of what followed upon St. Paul's "conversion" at Damascus: there Ananias (of whom we do not gather whether he was an ordained minister or a simple layman) is described as laying his hands on the convert, by which he might be filled with the Holy Ghost, and after that he arose and was baptized (v. 18); and (*b*) the account given in the next chapter (x. 44 ff.) of St. Peter's conversion of Cornelius and his kinsmen and near friends; there "while Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the words" (v. 44). It is true that in the former of these passages it is imposition of hands (again pl.), not unction that is spoken of, while in the latter neither imposition nor unction is mentioned.[1] But the important point is that in both cases the outpouring of the Holy Ghost (the grace specially conveyed by Confirmation) preceded, not followed, Baptism, which seems to imply that, whether imposition or unction or both were actually employed or not, there was taken to be scriptural warrant for Confirmation being administered either before or after Baptism.

---

[1] Dr. Chase urges that 2 Tim. i. 6 refers to Confirmation, not to Ordination, as 1 Tim. iv. 14 certainly does; and if he is right, that may be as early a reference as those in the Acts.

[2] *Confirmation in the Apostolic Age.*

It appears, indeed, to be likely that where and so long as pre-baptismal unction was employed for this purpose, it was either actually accompanied by the laying on of hands or was looked upon as equivalent to it. The oil, or chrism, was consecrated and was first applied to the head, or forehead, or breast, and then the whole body was anointed, the bishop or priest who officiated being assisted by a deacon for male, by a deaconess for female candidates. Later on post-baptismal unction was introduced into the East Syrian Rites, the pre-baptismal anointing being still retained; the Nestorian Church was the last to make this addition under Iso'yabh III, its reforming Catholicos in the middle of the seventh century, who also provided for an "imposition of the hand with an appropriate prayer" as well as "the signing of the forehead with oil [not ointment] accompanied by a formula" (Lawlor). Henceforward the post-baptismal unction has been looked upon as the confirmation ceremony throughout these churches, and is mostly performed with consecrated chrism, all reference to the giving of the Holy Spirit being removed, except among the Syrian Monophysites, from the pre-baptismal unction, which is in some parts performed with simple oil.[1]

---

[1] In *Apost. Const.*, unction appears twice to be called χειροθεσία (viz. iii. 15 and vii. 44).

The Armenian Church, though " Syrian " in its first origins, and then " Cappadocian " through its re-founder, Gregory the Illuminator (fourth century), finally came under the predominating influence of the Greek Orthodox Church, and at the present time has lost all trace of any unction of a candidate before his baptism, but when this practice was removed is unknown.[2] The neophyte is anointed by the priest on various parts of his body immediately after baptism with holy oil " the seal " " in the name of Christ." The only reference here to the grace of the Holy Spirit is in the prayer (from a Syrian source) which precedes this ceremony: " Replenish him with the grace of thy Holy Spirit, that he may become a temple of dwelling of thy holy name," etc., and this gift is much more definitely associated with the baptism itself. Later on, after he has been clothed in white, crowned and communicated, a further prayer of praise repeats this petition in the words, " Keep this man in the holiness of thy Spirit," etc.

In the Greek-speaking Churches of Antioch and Jerusalem there was from the first unction with chrism on the brow and the other *αἰσθητήρια* directly after baptism as well as a pre-baptismal anointing with the oil of exorcism; and here this second act was looked upon as conveying the grace of Confirmation. Our chief sources of information are connected with the Church in Jerusalem, viz. the Pilgrimage of Etheria of the end of the fourth century, and St. Cyril of Jerusalem's *Catecheses* of a somewhat earlier period (348). The Pseudo-Dionysius (who was perhaps a Syrian of about A.D. 500), and James of Edessa (towards the end of the seventh cent.) in their writings indicate a compression of the rites of Baptism and Confirmation into a single service, with much elaboration of details, instead of the long series of instructions and ceremonies spread over many days in the case of Baptism and separated from Confirmation by a considerable interval, which had formerly prevailed.

---

[1] The Paulician sect in Armenia, in accordance with its strictly puritanical tenets, removed both unction and imposition of hands from its baptismal office, though it included prayers for the gift of the Holy Spirit (Lawlor, who quotes Conybeare, *Key*, p. 96).

[2] See Thompson, *Offices of Baptism and Confirmation*, pp. 80, 85.

The Rite of the Greek Church of Constantinople, with its allied Churches, exhibits essentially the same features as that of the West Syrian Churches from which it is derived, *i.e.* (1) a pre-baptismal anointing with holy oil, first of the brow, breast and back and then of the whole body, (2) a post-baptismal unction with chrism by the priest of the brow, eyes, nostrils, mouth and ears. Simple as it is, this second unction is evidently intended to be the Confirmation proper as the words of administration are "the seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit," whereas at the first the formula is: "N. is anointed with the oil of gladness in the name of the Father, and the Son and the Holy Ghost." There is no trace whatever of imposition of hands.

We next pass to Egypt, which stands as it were midway between the East and the West, and there we have the early witness, such as it is, of the Prayer Book of Sarapion, Bishop of Thmuis (fourth century), as well as that of the Egyptian Church Order (third century), which though now ascribed with much plausibility to Hippolytus, Bishop of Rome, undoubtedly has some affinities with the Coptic Church of Egypt. We gather that here, too, from early times, there was a pre- and post-baptismal anointing and likewise an imposition of hand, and these features are still retained in both the Coptic and the Ethiopic (or Abyssinian) rites; in the latter there are even two impositions, one before administering the Holy Communion and one after. A third action is found in one version of the Coptic rite but not in others nor in the Ethiopic, viz. the insufflation, where the bishop or priest breathes on the neophyte and prays that he may receive the Holy Ghost; but this was never probably an essential nor invariable part of the service.

Insufflation in the *preliminary* ceremonies of Baptism is found in other places, East and West. The closest parallel to the Spanish use is found in the Bobbio Missal (for Gaul or Ireland) where *ad christianum faciendum* there is an insufflation after the signing and saying of the Creed with the formula, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum; in cor reteneas.*

For the Roman province of Africa, in which we first step out of Eastern into Western Christendom from Egypt, we have no liturgical texts to consult: they have all perished. Nevertheless, we have very early as well as later, and also frequent and full, references to confirmation rites in African writers, of whom Tertullian is the earliest and an explicit witness, and St. Augustine of Hippo is the fullest and most valuable for the later period. There are also various conciliar decisions which bear on the matter. We learn that Confirmation was administered after Baptism, (*a*) by means of unction with oil, as Tertullian calls it, although a little later St. Cyprian identifies oil with chrism, and this was specially to be consecrated for the purpose at the Altar by the bishop; and (*b*) this unction was followed by imposition of the hand. There was apparently no pre-baptismal unction or laying on of hands in this Church,[1] as in the East. Whether what remained of a Catholic Church after the devastations of the Donatists, the Vandals, and the Moors modified their confirmation rite under the Roman influence which predominated elsewhere (except at Milan) we have, I believe, no evidence to show.

It is convenient to take the Milanese and other "Gallican" uses of the West before that of Rome, because, except for the very early witness of Justin Martyr (so far as it goes) and the service enshrined in the Eg. C. O., which we take to be substantially that of Hippolytus's Ἀποστολικὴ Παράδοσις († 225) and which is of a general character, the evidence for these non-Roman rites before they were superseded by the all-prevailing Roman use is fuller and more precise: and also, because by leaving the Roman service till last, we can pass directly from it through the Use of Sarum to our own reformed service of 1549 and from that to our present service.

---

[1] The imposition of hands on entering the catechumenate is a different matter.

St. Ambrose's tract *de Mysteriis* and the closely allied *de Sacramentis* by an unknown author show us what was the practice at Milan, and probably throughout the north of Italy, in the fourth century; and that use lingered at least in a partial and modified form until the time of Beroldus (twelfth century) if not somewhat longer. Subsequently the Roman Use, which had already been gaining ground there as elsewhere, entirely superseded it. Immediately after Baptism the earlier use provided an unction of the head with chrism by the bishop (*Sacerdos*) and the prayer used was nearly the same as that provided in the Roman Rite of a somewhat later age for post-baptismal unction by a presbyter, viz. "Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath regenerated you with water and the Holy Ghost and hath given you remission of all your sins, anoints you with the chrism of salvation, in Christ Jesus our Lord unto life eternal"[1] (see below on p. 253). This, which was followed by the ceremonial washing of the candidates' feet (for which see further on p. 255), may perhaps be taken as the first part of Confirmation; the more important part, however, consisted of the subsequent "signing" with the "seal" (? of a second unction) by which the sevenfold gift of the Holy Spirit was given. There is no evidence of an imposition of the hand forming part of this rite; and in Gaul and Ireland also Confirmation was by unction after Baptism only, without any laying on of hands, so far as we can tell.

In Spain, however, the case was different. There we find after Baptism a signing on the brow with chrism accompanied by the formula, "The sign [or seal, *signum*] of eternal life which God the Father hath given through Jesus Christ, His Son, to those who believe unto salvation" (comp. the "Gelasian" formula: "The sign of Xt. to life eternal"). Then follows the imposition of the hand, with a prayer for the sevenfold gift of the Holy Spirit. Probably the priest usually performed both these rites, although, in theory, the latter at least was to be restricted to the bishop.

---

[1] This is somewhat similar, as will be noticed, to the familiar prayer at the beginning of our own Office, which is derived from the medieval Roman Rite (through the Sarum Use).

At the end of the third century there was at Rome both a laying on of hands and an anointing with oil, if the witness of the Eg. C. O. is accepted as virtually that of the Ἀποστολική Παράδοσις, and therefore, Roman. Immediately after baptism the neophyte was first anointed with consecrated oil "in the name of Jesus Christ" by the presbyter; and then, putting on his clothes, he was led from the baptistery into the church, and the bishop (*a*) laid his hand on him with an invocation of the Holy Spirit's grace, and (*b*) anointed him on the head with the consecrated oil in the name of the Holy Spirit, and (*c*) signed him on the brow, gave him a kiss.[1] The imposition is retained in the "Gelasian" Sacramentary (seventh or eighth century), but no mention of it is made in the Greg. Sacr. (ninth century), where we have, after the unction on the head by the presbyter, only "a prayer for signing infants," invoking the sevenfold gift of the Holy Spirit. It would seem as if gradually actual imposition came to be more and more disused throughout the Roman Communion and gave place to the mere raising and extension of the hands towards the candidates for Confirmation now in use. The two unctions were allowed to be retained on the understanding that they are of a distinctive character and that the episcopal unction is Confirmation and conveys the gift of the Holy Spirit.

It is difficult to be sure whether both hands or only one (the right) was to be laid on the candidate's head. Both in East and West, the singular is much more frequently used than the plural almost from the first, and certainly seems to point to the use of only one hand: and that, we may note, seems to be the usual practice in the Churches of a Lutheran origin on the Continent; also among the French Protestants. In our own Communion the point is doubtful; for, while the rubric since 1549 has always mentioned the bishop's hand (sing.) and the formula in

---

[1] The part where the oil was put was bound with a linen band and not removed for three days; similar care was taken in other churches to guard the Sacrament from disrespect.

1549 ran: "I . . . laye my hande upon thee," yet the Title added in 1661 has the plural, and the prayer compiled in 1549 and used ever since (largely derived from Herman's *Pia Deliberatio*) speaks of the "children [servants 1661] upon whom, after the example of thy holy Apostles, we have now layed our handes."[1]

Hitherto we have confined ourselves almost entirely to as concise and clear an investigation as in so complicated a matter is possible of the use of the two main ceremonies (with their accompanying formulæ) which have from the first been always associated with Confirmation, whether in combination or one without the other, and we have seen that, except in apostolic times, unction has not infrequently been practised without imposition, and never imposition without unction until the Reformation; this is probably due to the fact that imposition was freely and frequently used for a good many other purposes than for the conveyance of the grace of Confirmation, while unction was very early associated, in various ways, with the baptismal rites of which Confirmation was the completion and the seal. There remain several subsidiary rites, some of which, though never held to be of the essence of the Sacrament, were once widely spread in close connexion with it, and at least in one case (that of the feet-washing at Milan) apparently at one time considered to be of some importance.

1. The *Kiss of Peace* was very generally given by the officiating minister to the neophyte in early times. It had no very distinct connexion with the Confirmation Rite and was afterwards discontinued. It would seem probable, however, that there is a trace of it in the salutation *Pax vobiscum.* ℟ *Et cum spiritu tuo* of the Roman Rite which was admirably rendered in our rite in 1549, but lost to us since 1552 (see p. 259).

2. The *putting on of white robes* has been universal in both East and West from very early days—probably almost from the first. The practice is perhaps more closely

---

[1] The reference to Acts viii. 14 ff. and xix 1 ff. may account for the plural here, though in Archbishop Herman's prayer there is no such reference, and yet the plural stands.

connected in its origin with Baptism itself, which in most cases it immediately followed,[1] but, as they were worn for seven days afterwards, they formed in a sense part of the confirmation ceremony also, when that was post-baptismal, and so long as Confirmation took place at none but the shortest interval after Baptism. No doubt it accounts for the white veil and dress with which girl candidates are ordinarily clothed for Confirmation in the Reformed Anglican Churches and for First Communion in the Roman Catholic Church.

3. The *giving of a lighted taper* at the same time was a Gallican custom adopted in the Roman and Sarum Uses.

4. Another ancient ceremony was a *crowning of the head* (at first with garlands of flowers, later, it seems, with some more durable material) together with a *girdling of the loins* in the later Syrian Rite and in Egypt. These were ceremonially removed in church on the eighth day.

5. The *washing of the feet* of the newly baptized (*pedilavium*) was another subsidiary ceremony which was once prevalent in the West, though never in the East. It was most prominent in Milan, but is also found in Africa, Spain, Gaul, and Ireland. Rome seems not to have known any such practice (except as one of the ceremonies on Maundy Thursday in a different connexion[2]), and when the Roman Rite prevailed throughout the West it disappeared. It lingered longest at Milan. When the bishop performed the baptism, he likewise performed, or at least began, this ceremony.

6. Another ceremony, which was adopted and for a time prevailed in the Egyptian as well as in the African and Roman Churches, was the offering to the candidates of a drink *of milk and honey* as symbolical of their new entrance

---

[1] In the Egyptian Rite and in the Spanish it was not till after the Chrismation and imposition of the hand, so that in those Churches its connexion with Confirmation is closer.

[2] Something of the kind, apart from the ceremonial bathing of candidates for Baptism on this day, seems to have been known as early as St. Augustine's time, who speaks, somewhat obscurely, of the objection that was felt by many to its closer association with the baptism itself: *Ep. ad. Jan.* lv. 33.

into the promised "Land flowing with milk and honey."[1] The earliest witnesses to this are Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Hippolytus. It is generally assumed that the custom died out fairly soon, but a benediction of Milk, Honey (and Water), for insertion in the Canon is found in Sacramentaries (or Missals) as late as the eleventh century, whether it was still actually used by then or not. In the Ethiopian Rite it is retained to the present time (Denz. *Rit. Or.* i. 232); but not in the Coptic.[2]

7. It is well known that the custom of giving the Holy Communion immediately after Confirmation, even to infants, was for some time universal, so soon as Infant Baptism became general, throughout Christendom, except possibly in Gaul and Ireland.[3] The Greeks and many of the Easterns[4] still retain the practice, and it remained in the Roman Rite until Baptism and Confirmation were normally separated by a considerable interval: and even there, on the rare occasions where Confirmation is administered to an infant immediately after Baptism, it can be given.[5]

8. In the Modern Roman rite there are three details which call for some mention: (*a*) The substitution of merely extending the hands over or towards the candidates for direct imposition at the prayer for the sevenfold gift has already been touched upon (p. 253). (*b*) After the unction on the brow with the words "*Confirmo te chrismate salutis in nomine*," etc., the bishop is to strike the candidate lightly on the cheek, saying, "*Pax tecum.*" Is this a remnant of the Kiss of Peace, or does it, as Mr. Thompson suggests, descend from the *alapa* (blow) which the liberated slave

---

[1] The allusions to milk and honey in the *Odes of Solomon* must be purely figurative, and cannot have a baptismal reference as possibly those to garlands have (see above p. 255), because no such custom was known in the East.

[2] In the Ordo Romanus I the pontiff is to give each infant, after coming out of the font, *stolam, casulam, et chrismale et siliquas* (small coins).

[3] It is not actually provided for in the extant books, but see Warren, *Celtic Ritual*, p. 136.

[4] In the modern Nestorian Rite it has long fallen into desuetude (Lawlor, p. 4).

[5] Dr. Frere (*Hist. of B.C.P.* p. 565) quotes the case of Queen Elizabeth.

received at his manumission? Father Thurston thinks it may have been either an imitation of the blow by which knighthood was conferred or by way of impressing the fact of his confirmation on the memory of the candidate (as formerly boys were whipped or bumped at the beating of the bounds of the parish). He quotes "as an early instance" of this practice the *Life of St. Hugh of Lincoln* (before A.D. 1200): it does not, however, appear in the Sarum Manual. (*c*) One of the rubrics directs that in the case of an adult or adolescent being confirmed, he should put his foot on his godfather's (or, in the case of a girl, on her godmother's), as being too big to be presented in the arms of the sponsor. Father Thurston considers "this a vestige of some feudal practice of Confirmation"; but in practice it is now obsolete, though still printed; it was probably never very much insisted on, nor is it of long standing.

II. The English Rite

The first Prayer Book of Edward VI (1549) followed pretty closely the Roman Use as it was contained in the Sarum Manual of the time: that is to say, it began with the Versicles and Responses as in our present book, except that the last were: "℣. The Lord be with you. ℟. And with thy spirit," altered in 1552 to the less common and more appropriate "℣. Lord, hear our prayer. ℟. And let our cry come to thee." Then followed the ancient prayer invoking the Holy Spirit, derived from Gel. i. 44 (which we still use with slight alterations), together with the prayer, "Signe them (o lorde) and mark them to be thyne for ever, by the virtue of thy holy crosse and passion. Confirme and strength(en) them with the inward unction of thy holy Gost mercifully unto everlasting life." Thereupon the bishop crossed them in the forehead and laid "his hands upon theyr head saying, N. I sign thee with the signe of the crosse and laye my hande upon thee in the name, etc. Thus shall he doe to every childe one after another.

And when he hath layed his hande upon every childe, then shall he say, The peace of the Lorde abide with you. ℟. And with thy spirit." The service ended with the bishop first saying the prayer, "Almighty, everliving God," etc., and then blessing those he had confirmed.

The important points to be noticed in this office are (1) that, though a signing on the brow is retained, no mention is made of its being done with chrism or oil, as was still to be practised, together with the white vesture at the end of public Baptism; and (2) that stress is laid upon its spiritual significance by the substitution of the words "with the *in*ward unction of thy holy Gost" for the original *chrismate salutis*.[1]

In 1552 all mention of signing with the cross was removed, and the bishop was instructed simply to "laye his hande upon every chylde severally, saying, Defend, o Lord, this child," etc., as now. In 1662 the alterations were much less happy than usual. The adaptation of what was formerly a rubric with its stiff phraseology as an opening address (called "this Preface") was most unfortunate. The addition of the preliminary question to the candidates and their answer has no doubt much to be said in its favour,[2] but the language in which the question is couched, with its play upon the word "confirm," goes far to nullify its value. The alternative (or "this thy servant") for "this thy child" in the prayer "Defend, o Lord," etc., strikes a wrong note. It is due to one of Bishop Wren's suggestions, and is obviously meant to meet the case of those "of Riper Years" of whom there were many after the Restoration, and who had a special Form of Public Baptism provided for them in 1661 (see Preface to B.C.P., fourth paragraph). But Wren wrote "(this child) thy servant," meaning, we suppose, that "this child" should be omitted in the case of an adult, which, though unnecessary, if not undesirable, is rendered still further inapt by the form adopted by Convocation, when "this thy child" is made *alternative* to "this thy servant." If they had been content only to insert "thy" before "child," and omitted the alternative altogether, they would have avoided the implication that an adult is not equally God's child with the youngest candidate: and in practice the alternative is seldom heard. Again, the substitution of "The Lord be with you. ℟. And with thy spirit" (not unreasonably removed from the Versicles and Responses at the beginning of the service of 1552) for the salutation, "The peace of the Lorde abyde with you. ℟. And with thy spirite," is to be regretted, as the latter represents the Sarum *Pax vobiscum*, and may be traced to the ancient giving of the Kiss of Peace (see p. 254). On the other hand, the addition of the Lord's Prayer after the laying on of hands, is a distinct gain and in accordance with the general usage of our B.C.P., where it is put at the climax of the service. Probably there is nothing to be said either for or against the insertion (in 1661) of the collect "O Almighty Lord," etc., before the Blessing: it is one of the six printed at the end of the Holy Communion Service since 1549, and in a general way appropriate.

---

[1] The feeling of the time against the use of actual anointing, and also in favour of a public examination, is well exemplified, though at a somewhat later period, by the expressions in Nowell's *Catechism* (1570) on Confirmation. The older practice, he says, was for the bishop to examine children in the rudiments of the faith before *imposita illis manu bene precatus dimittebat*, but latterly (before the Reformation) they had substituted the senseless practice *ut infantes adhuc fari nescios nedum ad rationem Fidei reddendum idoneos oleo ungerent additis aliis etiam cæremoniis sanctæ Scripturæ et veteri ecclesiæ incognitis*. This was, however, quite inaccurate, as we have seen; and the later medieval Church in the West had distinctly discouraged very young children from being confirmed. And yet the 3rd "consideration" in the rubric before the Catechism (1549) had laid even greater and less warrantable stress upon the usage of the Church in times past with regard to this point: "it was ordained that Conf. should be ministered to them that were of perfect age," etc. (See Brightman, *Eng. Rite*, i. p. cxxi.)

[2] The rubric in 1549 and 1552 had directed that "the Bishop (or such as he shall appointe) shall by hys discrecion appose them" in some of the questions out of the short Catechism, which then ended with "the Desire."

In the Scottish Episcopal Church Canon xl. § 5 provides that the bishop may at his discretion, with the concurrence of the clergyman, use the following form in addition to that prescribed in the B.C.P.: "N., I sign thee with the sign of the Cross (here he shall sign the person with the sign of the Cross on the forehead) and I lay my hands upon thee in the name, etc., saying, Defend, etc.": he may also (§ 6) substitute a suitable address for the present Preface and modify the question, "Do ye here," etc., as the circumstances may seem to him to require.

The Irish Church has made no change of any importance in the Office.

The American Protestant Episcopal Church also has up till now introduced no changes except (*a*) a form for presenting those who are to be confirmed to the bishop, followed (*b*) by a lesson (permissive) taken from Acts viii. 14-17, before the prescribed question is asked.[1] A rubric directs the minister "earnestly to move these confirmed to come, without delay, to the Lord's Supper."

But since 1913 the General Convention has more than once dealt with proposals of considerable importance made by a Committee which was appointed to report on Prayer Book Revision. Most of these were, however, finally rejected in 1925, and this service still stands substantially the same as hitherto, except that the "Preface" is in future to be omitted altogether. The other adopted changes are too slight to need mention here, but the two principal changes which have not been adopted are of sufficient interest to be recorded; they were as follows:

(1) Instead of the single question "Do ye here," etc., there were to be three interrogatories and answers, viz. "Dost thou here in the presence of God and of this congregation promise to obey and follow our Lord J. Xt., resisting the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil and renouncing all that is evil? ℟. I do. Rehearse the Articles of thy belief. ℟. I believe, etc. Wilt thou obediently keep God's holy will and commandments and walk in the same all the days of thy life? ℟. I will, by God's help."[2]

---

[1] Changes (*a*) and (*b*) have been adopted by the Church of England in Canada (1915), together with an addition to the "Preface" of our rite, giving two further reasons for Confirmation (apostolic usage and the gift of the Holy Spirit) besides more clearly stating the one already given (the ratifying of baptismal vows).

[2] This is also one of the suggestions of N.A. 84, as an alternative.

(2) After the Hymn *Veni Creator* (permissive) the bishop was to confirm the candidates on this wise:

"N. I [sign thee with the sign of the Cross and] I confirm thee in the Name," etc., the signing with the sign of the Cross being permissive.

Amongst ourselves in England the final stage in the revision of this service has now been reached and the House of Bishops will before long promulgate their decision for our acceptance. It would be unbecoming to attempt a forecast of what that will be in principle or in detail; but, if any or all the suggested changes on pp. 83–85 of N.A. 84 (1923) should commend themselves to the Bishops—at least as alternatives—they would no doubt be very loyally accepted, whilst, as the foregoing pages of this chapter have shown, the signing (with or without chrism) on the forehead and the *Pax* after the laying on of hands have long been practised in many parts of Christendom.

III. Protestant Usages

It is of some interest and value to notice briefly, in conclusion, what are the present usages in Confirmation among other Reformed Bodies besides our own.

In the Scandinavian Churches the conservative influences of Luther's movement have been more strongly and permanently maintained than in a large part of Protestant Germany itself, where the school of Zwingli and his associates has often prevailed. The Danish and the Norwegian Churches have preserved rather more of the older ritual than the Swedish; at all events, an imposition of the (right) hand on each candidate's head is prescribed in their services, whereas in the Swedish it is not, although we hear that it is actually often practised, or else that the minister extends his hands towards them, as in the Roman Rite. The minister in all three Churches is usually the parish priest, or *probst*, not the bishop. Prominence is given to a public examination of the candidates beforehand,

and very little, if any, stress on the particular action of the Holy Spirit as the issue of the rite.

The same features mark the present administration of Confirmation throughout the "Evangelical" Church of Germany, an imposition of the hand being retained. The prevailing practice dates from the *Kirchenagende* of King Frederick William III of Prussia issued in the early part of the nineteenth century. Up till then there had been considerable diversity and confusion, and Confirmation of any kind had had a hard fight for existence.

The French Protestants have a service for the admission of catechumens to the Lord's Supper, which was drawn up by Eugène Bersier (pasteur à Paris) in 1874, but, as might be expected, with all special reference to the Holy Spirit omitted. After a public examination in faith, repentance, etc., the minister is to lay his right hand on the head of each person as he kneels before him (his own posture, whether he is to stand or sit, is not prescribed) and say, "N., je te confirme dans l'alliance du baptême au nom du Père, du Fils et du Saint-Esprit." Bersier claims, in the preface, that he has drawn from ancient sources in revising the forms of service which he publishes and which by the eighteenth century had degenerated too much into long discourses, and had not given the congregation enough share in what was proceeding.

I have not ascertained the present usages of the Protestant Bodies of Switzerland, Italy, or Spain; but they are not likely to contain anything very different from what has been described elsewhere.

Throughout this chapter I have been much indebted to the late Rev. T. Thompson's admirable volume on the *Offices of Baptism and Confirmation* in the Cambridge Handbooks of Liturgical Study, 1914, and to Dr. Lawlor's and Father Thurston's articles on Confirmation in Hastings' *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*, vol. iv. I have, of course, used with advantage Denzinger's indispensable *Ritus Orientalium*, and Conybeare and Maclean's *Rituale Armenorum*. Canon Brightman's *English Rite* has been equally valuable for the Anglican Use, and the late Rev. W. C. Bishop kindly furnished me with the extract from the Mozarabic *Liber Ordinum* (ed. Férotin), which I have since been able to verify for myself.

In an Appendix I have given, by way of illustration, some typical rites more or less in full, but it is difficult to be sure that the selection is the best possible.

APPENDIX I

THE "EGYPTIAN CHURCH ORDER"

(As given in Hauler, p. 110, and quoted by Dom Conolly, p. 185)

Postea cum ascenderit [e fonte] ungueatur a presbytero de illo oleo quod sanctificatum est, dicente ungueo te oleo sancto in nomine Jesu Christi, et ita singuli detergentes se iam induantur et postea in ecclesia ingrediantur. Episcopus vero manum illis imponens invocet dicens, "Domine Deus, qui dignos fecisti eos remissionem mereri "peccatorum per lauacrum regenerationis spiritus sancti inmitte in "eos tuam gratiam, tibi serviant secundum uoluntatem tuam: "quoniam tibi est gloria patri et filio cum spiritu sancto in sancta "ecclesia et nunc et in sæcula sæculorum. Amen." Postea oleum sanctificatum infundens de manu et imponens in capite dicat "ungueo te sancto oleo in domino patre omnipotente et Christo "Jesu et spiritu sancto," et consignans in frontem offerat osculum et dicat "Dominus tecum," et ille qui signatus est, dicat "et cum spiritu tuo," ita singulis faciat. Et postea iam simul cum omni populo orent non primum orantes cum fidelibus, nisi omnia hæc fuerint consecuti, et cum orauerint, de ore pacem offerant.

Holy Communion is then spoken of as apparently following at once, and allusion is made to the mixture of milk and honey in this connexion: evidently the newly baptized received both.

If Dom Conolly is correct in ascribing this to Hippolytus, we have here the Confirmation Rite of Rome at the beginning of the third century.

APPENDIX II

THE SYRIAN (MARONITE) "CONFIRMATION" OF JAMES SARUG

(Denz. *Rit. Or.* i. 341 ff. ex Assemano)

(*a*) *Before the Baptism*

Sacerdos accipit oleum simplex et dicit super illud hanc precationem: Sancte et gloriose qui, etc. *Diaconus*: iterum atque iterum pro hoc unctionis oleo quod consecratum est, et pro sacerdote qui ipsum consecravit et pro iis qui ab ipso unguntur ut Dominus Deus . . . procul removeat ab iis malos immundosque spiritus; faciat eos pura templa habitationi spiritus sui sancti, etc. *Signat oleo puerum in fronte* : signatur talis agnus in grege Chr. oleo vivo divinæ unctionis in nomine Patris vivi ad vitam. Amen. in nomine Filii unigeniti vivi ad vitam. Amen. in nomine Spiritus Sancti ad vitam sæculi sæculorum. *Sacerdos* : laus tibi qui bona nobis semper facis opemque nobis continuam præstas : exaudi preces nostras de excelso sanctuario tuo et de sede maiestatis tuæ Domine noster. *Diaconus* : Stemus recte orantes. Quam terribilis ac tremenda est hora ista in qua superi in silentio stant super aquas baptismi. . . . Angeli enim suis ordinibus . . . omnes ex igne geniti et in igne commorantes ignem miscent cum aquis istis ut per eas expientur filii Adæ terreni ; et gestantes vela ignea stant super Jordanis fluvium Dei qui[1] ad perfectum baptismum venit ; Spiritus vero Sanctus e sublimi cælo descendit super ipsum non ut eum sanctificet sed ut testimonium illi perhibeat, etc. Gloriam perennem cum adoratione, honorem et decorem attollamus æqualiter Patri, qui nobis Unigenitum suum misit et Filio qui nobis aperuit baptisma in expiationem debitorum et remissionem peccatorum atque onus peccati a nobis deposuit per Spiritum suum Sanctum nosque dignos reddidit qui accedamus ad suum sanctum corpus et sanguinem a modo et usque in sæculum. Iterum Dominam precemur. *Extollit vocem suam* : adveniat Domine Spiritus tuus Vivus et Sanctus et habitet et requiescat super caput huius famuli tui et obsignetur in nomine tuo Pater vive in nomine Filii tui Unigeniti et Spiritus tui Paracliti qui nostra dimittit debita nunc. *Inclinatus* : et sanctificetur corpus famuli tui ac anima obsignati tui : confirmetur mens eius in veritate tua ac fide tua intellectus eius impleatur et attollemus. *Extollit vocem ter dicens* : gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto, mysterio adorando et glorioso in quo non est divisio nunc ; *et subiungit* : tranquillitas Dei Patris omnipotentis et pax Filii omnia gubernantis cum pace et communicatione Spiritus sancti omnia sanctificantis et expiantis sit nobiscum et inter nos atque cum sancto hoc baptismo.

(*b*) *After the Baptism*

Sacerdos accipit sanctum chrisma ac baptizatum in fronte consignat dicens : chrismate Chr. Dei suavi veræ fidei odore sigillo et complemento gratiæ Spiritus Sancti obsignatur N. servus Dei in nomine, etc. *Et ungit totum eius corpus. Tunc albis vestimentis baptizatum induunt et orat Sacerdos* : benedictus es, Domine Deus, cuius magnæ et ineffabili gratia sanctificatæ sunt aquæ istæ per adventum Spiritus Sancti ut essent uterus spiritualis hominem novum e vetere generans ; et famulum tuum hunc lavacro quod per aquam et Spiritum fit, dignum effecisti. Tu Domine propter multas miserationes tuas dignum illum redde qui cæleste tuum regnum penetret ut nos et ipse una attollamus gloriam honorem et adorationem tibi Pater Vive et Chr. Filio tuo unico ac Spiritui tuo Sancto. [*Alia oratio* : Deus cuius magna et multiplicia sunt munera, Pater Domini nostri J. Chr. quique illum misisti, qui etiam ad adoptionem filiorum tuorum extollis homines plenos odore suavi Chr. tui, qui etiam chrisma hoc, quod nobis promiseras, per virtutem tuam invisibilem sanctificas ad auxilium infirmitatis nostræ : da nobis per hoc sigillum unionem Spiritus tui Sancti et gloriam regni tui veri illis qui sanctificati sunt ; et da in adventu Chr. tui gloriam præclaram et fructus uberes, quia omnia facilia tibi et plana sunt ut cum unanimitate et concordia mereamur nos et illi referre tibi gloriam et laudem, etc.] *Et lumbos eius præcingit et dicunt*. . . . Fratres mei gloriam canite Filio Dñi universorum, qui fratri nostro carissimo coronam nexuit. Illustratum est vestimentum tuum, frater noster, instar solis et decor tuus splenduit præ fluvio Jordanis. Instar angeli ascendisti, frater noster, e fluentis Jordanis per virtutem Spiritus Sancti. Speciosum est vestimentum tuum, fili mi, et pulcra est corona tua, quam per manus meas hodie tibi sacerdos nexuit.[1] *Et participem illum facit sanctorum mysteriorum dicens* : esto Domine custos huius agni qui factus est de grege tuo et baptismo tuo tinctus est ac in mysterio Sanctæ Trinitatis obsignatus ut educetur et adolescat in vera tua fide et caritatis tuæ particeps fiat sitque vas utile honori tuo et gloriæ magnitudinis, tuæ ; Pater et Fili et Spiritus Sancte, tibi gloria in sæcula. Amen.

---

[1] The text seems corrupt : what is wanted is quando Dei filius ; or the like.

One or two things are to be noticed in this Rite : (*a*) that the action of the Holy Spirit is more closely associated with the waters of Baptism than with the oil of Unction : (*b*) that the whole service of Baptism has by this time been fitted into a Eucharistic framework (see Thompson, pp. 60 and 65 ff.). Both these points came out in the extracts given but are more clearly indicated in the parts omitted. (*c*) The subsidiary ceremonies of the crowning and girdling are implied, but not actually provided for in the rubrics, which are on this point probably defective.

APPENDIX III

THE COPTIC CONFIRMATION

(Denzinger, *Rit. Or.* i. pp. 209 ff. ex Assemano)

(*a*) *Sacerdos tenet sancti chrismatis vas et coram altari orat super illud* : Domine qui solus et omnipotens et omnia mirabilia agens, nihil que tibi Domine impossibile est, sed bene placito tuo in omnibus efficax exstat virtus tua: elargire Sanctum Spiritum per sancti chrismatis unctionem ut fiat vivificum obsignaculum et famulo tuo robur, seu confirmatio per Filium tuum unigenitum Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum per quem, etc.

---

[1] The first three of these sentences can be sung by the choir : the last apparently is said by the deacon.

Deinde sancto chrismate unge frontem baptizati atque oculos sic dicens: in nomine Patris, etc., unctio gratiæ Spiritus Sancti. Amen. *Unge nares et os dicens:* unctio regni cælorum arrhabonis. Amen. *Deinde aures liniens dic*: unctio participationis æternæ vitæ et immortalitatis. Amen. *Unge manus intra et extra et dicito:* sancta Christi Dei nostri unctio et inviolatum sigillum. Amen. *Unge cor dicens:* Spiritus sancti gratiæ perfectio atque fidei et iustitiæ clipeus. Amen. *Eius genua, sola pedum, dorsum, brachia ac humeros et ante cor liniens dic:* linio te N. oleo sancto in nomine, etc.

(*b*) *Postea impone manum tuam super eum et dic*: benedicaris benedictione cælitum, angelorumque benedictione; Dominus Jesus Christus tibi in suo nomine benedicat.

(*c*) *Hic in gloriosæ crucis figuram insuffla in faciem eius:* accipe Spiritum sanctum et vas purum esto; per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, cui est gloria cum ipsius Patre bono et Spiritu Sancto nunc et semper, etc.

(*d*) *Deinde baptizatus albis induatur vestimentis, et dicat sacerdos*: incorruptibilis atque immortalis vitæ æternæ indumentum. *Diaconus*: Dominum precemur. *Sacerdos*: Dominator Domine Deus omnipotens, Pater Domini Dei et Salvatoris nostri Jesus Christi, qui famulo tuo per regenerationis lavacrum renasci largitus es, eique peccatorum suorum expiationem ac incorruptibile indumentum et filiorum adoptionis gratiam donasti: tu quoque Dominator noster super ipsum Spiritum Sanctum tuum nunc emitte. Fac eum æternæ vitæ et immortalitatis participem ut, quemadmodum Filius tuus Unigenitus Dominus Deus et Salvator noster J. Ch. promisit ei qui renatus est ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, in regnum cælorum introire valeat per nomen virtutem et gratiam eiusdem, etc.

(*e*) *Deinde canuntur antiphonæ in baptizati honorem. . . . Orationem hanc super coronam recitat sacerdos:* Domine Deus omnipotens Pater Domini nostri J. Chr., qui sanctis Apostolis tuis et prophetis tuis ac martyribus tuis qui tibi placuerunt incorruptibiles coronas præbuisti: tu etiam nunc coronam paratam et mox ponendam super famulum tuum per baptismum coniunctum benedic (*Hic sacerdos administrans una cum omnibus sacerdotibus ecclesiæ coronam benedicunt*) ut ipsi corona gloriæ sit ac honoris. Amen. benedictionis et glorificationis. Amen. corona virtutis et iustitiæ. Amen. corona sapientiæ et intelligentiæ. Amen. corrobora eum ut præcepta tua perficiat bonisque regni cælorum potiatur, per, etc.

Subsequentia dicit sacerdos, cum fuerit puer indutus et zona in forma crucis eius lumbi præcincti,[1] *in ponenda corona super illius caput* : in nomine, etc., gloria et honore coronasti eum : Pater benedicit Filius coronat, Spiritus Sanctus eum sanctificat et perficit. . . .

(*f*) *Sacramentorum communionem ei da et imponens manum super eum*[2] *dic :* benedictus es Dominator Domine Deus omnipotens Pater Domini nostri Dei et Salvatoris nostri J. Chr., qui famulum tuum regenerationis lavacro et peccatorum remissione, incorruptibili vestimento et pretiosa regni tui gloria præditi arrha, et Spiritus Sancti tui munere dignum effecisti ; te rogamus et precamur, hominum Amator, ut ipsum sancti corporis et venerabilis Chr. tui sanguinis participatione dignum efficias, eique firmam elargiaris hanc gratiam ut agonem suum secundum præcepta tu perficiat, sanctaque tua observet mandata et sanctorum beatitudinem ac cælorum regnum promereatur per gratiam, etc. *Benedic illi dicens* : augeatur famulus tuus Deus in sapientia tua : timorem tuum intelligere illum effice : ad provectam ætatem advenire illi concede : veritatis agnitionem ipsi elargire : sine macula in fide eum conserva per intercessiones Dominæ omnium nostrum Dei Genetricis [et aliorum].

APPENDIX IV

MOZARABIC *LIBER ORDINUM*

(Férotin, col. 32 ff.)

BAPTIZATO infante, accedit ad sacerdotem ille qui eum de fonte suscepit, tenens ipsum infantem vestitum in dextro brachio, capite discooperto, et crismat eum sacerdos, faciens signum crucis in sola fronte dicens :

Signum vitæ æternæ quod dedit Ds̄ P. om̄ps per J. Xr̄m̄ Filium suum credentibus in salutem. Amen.

Hoc peracto, item imponit ei manus impositionem ita:

Ds̄ qui unita virtute misterii in regenerandorum hominum sacramento Sanctum aquæ Spiritum contulisti ut Creator imperans creaturæ illius officio tinctos ablueret, quos suo beneficio confirmaret, per illum tolleret labem peccati, per se compleret gratiam sacramenti, atque ideo in traditione beati baptismatis adiciendam unctionem crismatis precepisti : tuam Dñe sequentes ut possumus sanctionem, te supplices petimus ac rogamus ut infundas super his famulis tuis Spm s̄cm tuum. Amen. Spm̄ sapientiæ et intellectus. Amen. Spm. consilii et fortitudinis. Amen. Spm. scientiæ et pietatis. Amen. Reple eos easque Spū tui timoris qui eis custodiam tui præcepti salutis inspirans, auram doni cælestis adspiret : quatenus confirmati in nomine Trinitatis, et per crisma Xrī et per Xm̄ mereantur effici Christiani.

---

[1] No special prayer is given for the girdling, but at the undoing of the girdle (*solutio cinguli*) on the eighth day a special service was provided (Denz. *loc. cit.* pp. 213 f.).

[2] The form given by Renaudot (Denz. *loc. cit.* p. 221) does not mention *this* imposition of the hand, but in the Ethiopic Rite it is clearly provided for here as well as after the unction and at the final benediction (see Denz. pp. 231 f.). This latter rite also retains the giving of the draught of milk and honey as well as of the bread and wine (see p. 256).

Post hæc velantur a sacerdote infantes ipsi qui baptizati sunt caput : quo peracto communicat eos.

APPENDIX V

THE "AMBROSIAN" RITE IN *BEROLDUS*

de Sabbato Sancto (Twelfth Century)

Post letanias archiepiscopus surgens chrismat prædictos baptizatos in frontibus in modum crucis, dicendo hanc orationem : Ds̄ Pater om̄ps Dni nostri J. Xri qui vos regeneravit ex aqua et spū sc̄o. Prædicti custodes debent suscipere praed. pueros bapt. de manibus patrum suorum qui eos traxerunt de fonte : et duo custodes maiores de octo minoribus debent esse præparati, unus cum vase aquæ, alter cum manutergio sumpto de camera archiep̄i, et tunc archiep̄s lavat pedes pueris tribus prædictis et extergit eos cum manutergio et osculatur : et ter imponit calcaneos[1] unius cuiusque super caput suum. (P. 112.)

[Not in Ambros. Pont (ninth cent.) ed. Magistretti ; see his preface, p. xxii.]

---

[1] *Calcaneos* = *calces* (heels) Isid. *Orig.* II. i. 14 : for this last detail, Magistretti in his notes quotes Joseph Visconti, *de Antiquis Bapt. Ritibus*, II. 17-20.

CHAPTER V

CONFIRMATION IN
(*A*) CHURCHES OF THE LATIN RITE

By T. J. Hardy

(*B*) THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH

By R. M. French

SUMMARY OF

(*A*)

I. The Rite.
II. The Matter and Form.
III. The Effects.
IV. The Minister.
V. The Recipient.
VI. Sponsors.
VII. The Obligation.
VIII. Some Outstanding Matters.

It is the purpose of this article to describe the doctrine and practice of Confirmation in churches of the Latin Rite. The subject is considered under the following heads: I. The Rite; II. The Matter and Form; III. The Effects; IV. The Minister; V. The Recipient; VI. Sponsors; VII. The Obligation; VIII. Some Outstanding Matters.

I. The Rite

Confirmation is a Sacrament, conveying character, for the perfecting of baptismal grace, and the strengthening of the soul by God the Holy Ghost for the purpose of professing the Faith. The origin of the word (*confirmation*, a making fast or sure) obviously expresses the relation of the sacrament to Baptism. In regard to its other effect it is sometimes called "the sacrament of the Holy Ghost," or, "the sacrament of the seal" (*signaculum*, *sigillum*). In regard to the external rite, there is no official Latin equivalent to the Eastern *ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν*, the "imposition of hands"; but it is sometimes known as "the anointing with chrism" (*unctio*, *chrismatio*). The general name, however, is *confirmatio*, which answers to the Eastern *τὸ μύρον*.

The present administration of the rite begins with a general imposition of hands, the bishop praying that the Holy Spirit may descend on those already regenerate. He then anoints the forehead of each with the chrism, saying: "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the Name," etc. Finally, he gives each a slight blow on the cheek, saying: "Peace be with thee." A prayer is added that the Holy Spirit may dwell in the hearts of those who have been confirmed, and the rite closes with the bishop's blessing.

As the rite is brief, it may be a convenience to the reader to find it added here practically *in extenso*:

The bishop proceeds to the faldstool before the altar, and, having washed his hands, he rises and stands with his face towards the persons to be confirmed, who kneel before him with their hands joined before their breasts. He then says:

SPIRITUS SANCTUS superveniat in vos, et virtus Altissimi custodiat vos a peccatis. ℟. Amen.

Then signing himself with his right hand with the sign of the cross ✠ *from his forehead to his breast, he says:*

℣. Adjutorium nostrum, etc. ℟. Qui fecit, etc. ℣. Domine, exaudi, etc. ℟. Et clamor mea, etc. ℣. Dominus vobiscum. ℟. Et cum spiritu tuo.

Then, with his hands extended towards those to be confirmed, he says:

Oremus. Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui regenerare

dignatus es hos famulos tuos ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto; quique dedisti eis remissionem omnium peccatorum; emitte in eos septiformem Spiritum tuum sanctum Paraclitum de cœlis. ℟. Amen.

Spiritum sapientiæ, et intellectus. ℟. Amen.

Spiritum consilii, et fortitudinis. ℟. Amen.

Spiritum scientiæ, et pietatis. ℟. Amen.

Adimple eos Spiritu timoris tui, et consigna eos signo cru ✠ cis Christi, in vitam propitiatus æternam. Per eundem Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum Filium tuum, qui tecum vivit et regnat in unitate ejusdem Spiritus Sancti Deus, per omnia sæcula sæculorum. ℟. Amen.

The bishop then inquires separately the name of each person to be confirmed, who is presented to him by the sponsor, kneeling; and, having dipped the end of his right thumb in the chrism, he says:

N., SIGNO TE SIGNO CRU ✠ CIS.

While saying these words he makes the sign of the cross with his thumb on the forehead of the person to be confirmed, and then says:

ET CONFIRMO TE CHRISMATE SALUTIS. IN NOMINE PA ✠ TRIS, ET FI ✠ LII, ET SPIRITUS ✠ SANCTI. ℟. Amen.

Then he strikes him gently on the cheek, saying:

Pax tecum.

When all have been confirmed, the bishop wipes his hands with breadcrumb, and washes them over a basin. While he is washing his hands the following antiphon is sung or read by the ministers:

Confirma hoc, Deus, quod operatus es in nobis a templo sancto tuo quod est in Jerusalem.

℣. Gloria Patria, etc. Amen.

The antiphon is repeated; after which the bishop, laying aside his mitre, rises up and standing towards the altar with his hands joined before his breast, says:

℣. Ostende nobis, Domine, etc. ℟. Et salutare tuum, etc. ℣. Domine, exaudi, etc. ℟. Et clamor, etc. ℣. Dominus vobiscum. ℟. Et cum, etc.

Then, his hands still joined before his breast, while all the persons confirmed devoutly kneel, he says:

Oremus. Deus, qui Apostolis tuis Sanctum dedisti Spiritum, et per eos, eorumque successores, ceteris fidelibus tradendum esse voluisti; respice propitius ad humilitatis nostræ famulatum, et præsta, ut eorum corda, quorum frontes sacro Chrismate delinvimus et signo sanctæ crucis signavimus, edem Spiritus Sanctus in eis superveniens templum gloriæ suæ dignanter inhabitando perficiat. Qui cum Patre, et eodem Spiritu Sancto vivis et regnas Deus, in sæcula sæculorum. ℟. Amen.

The bishop then says:

Ecce sic benedicetur omnis homo, qui timet Dominum.

And, turning to the persons confirmed, he makes over them the sign of the cross, saying:

Bene ✠ dicat vos Dominus ex Sion, ut videatis bona Jerusalem omnibus diebus vitæ vestræ, et habeatis vitam æternam. ℟. Amen.

It is admitted that much uncertainty exists as to the institution, matter, form, and minister of this sacrament—though this in no way interferes with its due administration. Nevertheless, the *theological* difficulties were felt to be so great at the time of the Council of Trent that very few canons were then formulated on the subject, and those were defensive rather than definitive. They affirm (Can. i) Confirmation to be a sacrament, as against Luther, etc. They condemn those (Can. ii) who maintain that to ascribe virtue to the sacred chrism is to offer outrage to the Holy Ghost; and (Can. iii) they decide that the ordinary minister is the bishop, and not any simple priest. Elsewhere (Sess. vii, Can. ix), the Council defined that "in Confirmation a *character* is imprinted in the soul, *i.e.* a certain spiritual and indelible sign on account of which the sacrament cannot be repeated." The Council did not define anything specifically about the institution by Christ—although (Sess. vii, Can. i) "all the sacraments of the New Law were instituted by Christ our Lord"—nor is anything whatever said as to the *form* of words used. Plainly the

Council, in this very guarded treatment of the sacrament, was anxious to avoid theological controversy.

II. The Matter and Form

The theological difficulties alluded to gather chiefly round the question of

(*A*) The *matter* of the sacrament. What constitutes the essential matter ? There have been four views current in the West :

1. That the essential matter consists in the imposition of hands alone ;
2. That it consists in the chrism alone ;
3. That it consists in either ;
4. That it consists in both.

1. The fact that (1) is upheld by the Ante-Nicene Fathers, by Ante-Nicene canon law and ritual, and by Post-Nicene testimony of great importance, belongs to the subject of Confirmation generally, and has been already treated in this work. We are here more immediately concerned with the testimony of medieval theologians, and among those upholding the view that the matter of Confirmation consists in the imposition of hands alone are the following : Œcumenius of Thessaly (*Comment. in Act. Apostol.* c. x), Theophylact (*Comment. in Act. Apostol.*), St. Isidore of Seville (*Originum*, lib. vi. c. ult.), Hildefonsus of Toledo (*de Cognitione Baptismi*, par. cxxii *et seq.*), Ven. Bede (*Comment. in Act. Apostol.* c. viii), Gregory III (*Ep.* vii, *ad Bonifacium*), Zachary (*Ep.* x, *ad Bonif.*), Alcuin (*Ep.* xc, *ad Oduinum*), Magnus of Sens (*ap. P. Sirmondus in Anterrhetico*), Thodulf of Orleans (*De Ordine Bapt.* c. 17), Amalarius of Trèves (*De Eccl. Off. lib.* i, c. 27 ; iv, c. 29), Jesse of Amiens (*Ep. de Ordine Bapt.*, Migne's *Patrologia*), Jonas of Orleans (*Aurel. de Inst.* i, c. 7), Walafridus Strabo (*De Exordiis et Incrementis*, c. 26), Hincmar of Rheims (*de Capit. Eccl.* c. 16), Haymo (*Pseudo-Primasius, in Heb.* vi. 2), Lanfranc (*in Heb.*), Hugh of St. Victor (*Lib. I de Sacrum*, c. 22), Innocent III (incorporated by Gratian in *Corpus Iuris Canonici*), Aquinas

(*Comment. Heb.*)—though, for his treatment of the chrism, see below. Amongst Canon Law authorities of this period favourable to this view are the Second Council of Seville (ii, c. 7); the Sixth of Paris (vi, c. 27); and the Synod of Durham (Can. xxxi). The Synod of Cologne in 1536 affords valuable because late evidence (C. Colon., p. 7, c. 8); and that of Mayence in 1547, *per manus episcoporum* (P.I. c. 17); and with this agrees the Synod of Rheims (1583), and of Narbonne in 1609—*per impositionem manuum episcopi* (*de Conf.* c. 15). These Latin Councils of the Reformation period are exceedingly interesting in their testimony.

2. The view that the matter of Confirmation consists in chrism alone (practically the view of the Eastern Church, though Eastern theologians hold that imposition of hands is sufficient for a valid Confirmation) has little support except from Duranus and the decree (*ad Armen.*) of Eugenius IV. It should, however, be remembered that it was the object of Eugenius and the Council of Florence to reunite East and West, hence the above decree undoubtedly meant some surrender of traditional theology.

3. A few have held, with Morinus and Tapper, that the matter consists either in imposition of hands or chrism, but this view may be said to be negligible, although it should be noted that Aquinas regards chrism as *conveniens materia huius sacramenti*, viewed in the light of the established usage of the Church (*Summa*, iii, Q. lxxii, a. 2).

4. "The most generally accepted view" (Scannell, *Cath. Encyc.* art. "Confirmation") is that the matter is imposition of hands and chrism *conjointly*. It should, however, be noted that the imposition referred to is not that with which we have seen the rite to begin, but that which takes place in anointing, namely, the action accompanying the words: *et confirmo te chrismate salutis, in Nomine*, etc. *Cf.* Peter the Lombard: *Pontifex per impositionem manus confirmandos ungit in fronte* (IV *Sent. dist.* xxxiii, n. 1; cf. De Augustinis, *de Re Sacramentaria*, 2nd Ed. Roma, 1889). This view is upheld by Bellarmine, P. Aurelius Maldonatus, and De Marca; and amongst modern theologians by Perrone, Gaume, and Bulsano.

As already remarked, the Council of Trent did not define in regard to the *matter*. The Catechism of the Council certainly teaches that chrism is the *matter*, but it should be remembered that the Catechism was not published until 1566, after the close of the Council, and theologians do not accept its conclusions respecting Confirmation. (*Cf.* Perrone, *Prælect. Theol.* c. iii, p. 131; Moehler, *Symbolik*, p. 14, tr. Robertson.)

(*B*) The *form*, *i.e.* the words of administration. The "Disciplina Arcani" of the primitive Church forbade the open publication of the form of the sacred Mysteries, and as late as the fifth century we find Innocent I declining to make known the form of Confirmation. In the absence, therefore, of exact knowledge of early precedent (except in the See of Milan (St. Ambr. *de Sacr.* lib. ii. 7), there is considerable room for speculation. The present form (see above, description of rite) is not older than the twelfth century, where it is first found in a Rouen Pontifical: *Consigno te signo crucis, et confirmo chrismate salutis in Nomine*, etc. Aquinas regards the formula, *Consigno te signo crucis*, as the "conveniens forma" of Confirmation. But St. Thomas is not consistent with himself in his teaching on Confirmation, as already noted. In an Ordo Romanus of the eighth century the sufficient formula is given as *Confirmo te in Nomine*, etc. It should be remarked that the present form, as given above, assumes the *matter* to be twofold, in accord with view 4 (see above). The present Eastern form, *Σφραγῖς δωρεᾶς πνεύματος ἁγίου. Ἀμήν*, is considered "unquestionably valid" (Scannell, *supra*).

III. The Effects of the Sacrament

These are (1) an increase of habitual grace, consummating the effect of Baptism; (2) a special sacramental grace consisting in the sevenfold Gift of the Holy Ghost, directed to giving strength and courage to confess faith in Christ; (3) a special effect of "character" (C. Tri. Sess. vii, c. ix), *i.e.* an ineffaceable mark or "seal" impressed upon the soul—in common with Baptism and Holy Order—by reason of which the sacrament cannot be received again by the same person. In addition to, or rather along with, these effects it should be noted that, in common with other sacraments, grace in Confirmation "eliminates venial sin, and (in Confirmation) most efficaciously because its influence extends to the whole life of faith and grace, strengthening and bringing it to perfection" (Schieler-Heuser, *Theory and Practice of the Confessional*, p. 34, New York, Benziger, 1919). Further, a spiritual relationship is contracted between the minister and sponsor, on the one hand, and the recipient and the recipient's parents on the other. This relationship constitutes a diriment impediment to marriage. It does not, however, arise between the minister and the sponsor, nor between the sponsors themselves, when more than one. (See below.)

IV. The Minister

The bishop alone is the ordinary minister, as expressly declared by the Council of Trent (Sess. vii, c. iii). Simple priests, however, may be (and have been in cases of missionary exigency) *extraordinary* ministers of the sacrament by special delegation from the Pope. In such cases they do not wear pontifical vestments, and are obliged, except in cases of necessity, to use the chrism blessed by a bishop, and must also observe the instructions prescribed in the Roman Ritual as issued by Propaganda, March 21, 1774. A bishop can confirm validly those who are not his own subjects, but to do so licitly he must obtain permission from the bishop of the diocese to which they belong.

V. The Recipient

Confirmation can be administered only to those who have been baptized, and not confirmed already. *Cf.* Aquinas: *quia ita se habet confirmatio ad baptismum, sicut augmentum ad generationem, ut ex supradictis patet: manifestum est autem, quod nullus potest promoveri in ætatem perfectam, nisi primo fuerit natus: et similiter nisi primo aliquis fuerit baptizatus, non potest sacramentum confirmationis accipere* (*Summa*, iii, Q. lxxii, a. 6). Such persons should be in a state of grace, *i.e.* should not be in mortal sin (as regards venial sin, see above, iii), since the Holy Spirit is given, not for the purpose of taking away sin, but of adding grace. Theologically speaking, the sacrament is validly (though not lawfully) received even by those in mortal sin. Such a distinction, however, would not be countenanced in practice, and the exhortation in the popular "Order of Administering" issued by authority in 1918 for those in England admonishes the candidates to "remember that you must be in a state of grace to receive it (Confirmation) worthily; for mortal sin, being opposed to grace, must necessarily hinder its effects." The sacrament of Penance is therefore the natural precursor of Confirmation. As regards the age of the recipient there is considerable latitude. The Catechism of the Council of Trent decides that, while the sacrament can be administered to all persons after Baptism, it is inexpedient before the use of reason, and so places the age of the recipient at seven. "For Confirmation has not been instituted as necessary to salvation, but in order that by virtue thereof we might be found well armed and prepared when called upon to fight for the faith of Christ, and for this kind of conflict none will consider children who are still without reason to be qualified" (Pt. II, c. iii, 18). Ordinarily speaking, therefore, Confirmation is not administered to those under seven years, though in danger of death, or, when the opportunity of being confirmed occurs but rarely, children may be confirmed at a younger age. Leo XIII, writing to the Bishop of Marseilles, heartily commends the practice of confirming children before their First Communion, as being more in accord with the custom of the ancient Church.

The requisite *dispositions* for the sacrament are stated to be: (1) a right understanding of it; (2) a conscience free from mortal sin; (3) retirement, prayer, and contemplation; also works of piety in imitation of the Apostles, the Blessed Virgin, and other saints.

VI. The Sponsors

One sponsor is obligatory under pain of grievous sin. Such a person should be at least fourteen years of age, and of the same sex as the candidate, and already confirmed. Neither parent of the candidate can be sponsor, nor, except in necessity, can the baptismal sponsor, nor a religious (unless the candidate be a religious); neither, of course, can the excommunicate nor notorious sinners (Sacred Congregation of the Council, February 16, 1884). While one sponsor only is requisite, two are permitted, provided the above conditions are fulfilled. No sponsor can stand for more than one candidate, except in necessity (Holy Office, June 16, 1884). In former times it was the custom for the sponsor to place his or her right foot upon the foot of the candidate during administration; the present custom is for the sponsor's right hand to be laid upon the candidate's right shoulder. It is not necessary that the recipient should receive a new or an additional name, but such practice has the sanction of several synodal decrees during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The Fifth Council of Milan, under St. Charles Borromeo, decreed that a candidate whose name was "vile, ridiculous, or unbecoming for a Christian," should receive another in Confirmation (*Cf.* Martène, *de Antiquis Eccl. Ritibus*, Roun, 1700).

VII. The Obligation

Concerning the *Obligation* to receive the sacrament, it is admitted that Confirmation is not *necessitate medii*; on the other hand, its reception is *necessitate præcepti* for all who are able to understand and fulfil the laws of God and the Church. It is especially binding on those who are exposed to persecution and grievous temptation or to the danger of death. Theologians are divided as to the gravity of the obligation, some opining that refusal is mortal sin, others that it is venial, unless it arise out of contempt for the sacrament. Such controversy, however, is negligible, since practically the benefits of the sacrament are so obvious that the obligation is, normally, unquestioned.

VIII. Some Outstanding Matters

As already admitted, the institution of the sacrament has been the subject of much discussion, but the decree of the Inquisition (*Lamentabile sane*, July 3, 1907) condemns the proposition that "there is no proof that the rite of the sacrament of Confirmation was employed by the Apostles; the formal distinction, therefore, between the two sacraments, Baptism and Confirmation, does not belong to the history of Christianity." As the chrism has so important a place in the rite, it may be observed that it consists of a mixture of oil of olives and balsam, blessed by the bishop (except in necessity; see above) in an especial manner, *i.e.* in a manner differing from the blessing oil of the sick and of catechumens (*cf.* Lehmkuhl, *Cas. Cons.* ii, n. 102). Neither the absence of balsam, however, nor of the special mode of blessing, invalidates the sacrament. The significance of the admixture is symbolical, signifying the copious outpouring of sacramental grace, and the fragrance of Christian virtue. A striking passage, much employed by the Fathers and Schoolmen in defence of the chrism, is that of St. Paul, in 2 Cor. ii. 15.

The signing of the cross on the forehead has a like significance with that in Baptism, and the stroke on the cheek at the words, *Pax tecum*, is significant of the outward tribulation which may be expected to accompany inward peace.

SUMMARY

Confirmation is a sacrament, conveying character, for the perfecting of baptismal grace, and the strengthening of the soul by the Holy Ghost for the purpose of professing the Faith; the matter consists in the imposition of hands with chrism, and the form, invocation of the Holy Spirit with the words: "*N. signo te signo cru✠cis et confirmo te Chrismate salutis in Nomine*, etc."; the bishop alone is the ordinary minister; the recipients are baptized persons of an age (except in necessity) above seven years; one sponsor is obligatory; while the sacrament is not necessary to salvation, it is binding on all who would keep the commandments of the Church.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A full bibliography will be found in the *Cath. Encyc.* vol. iv, art. Confirmation; that in Pohle, *Lehrb. d. Dogmatik* (Paderborn, 1898), should also be consulted. Wilhelm and Scannell, *Manual of Cath.*

Theol. (Lond. 1898), II; De Augustinis, *de Re Sacramentaria* (Rome, 1889); Dölger, *Das Sakrament d. Firmung* (Vienna, 1906); Vitasse, *de Sacr. Confirm.*, in Migne, *Theol. Cursus Comp.* xxi; Vassall-Phillips, *Cath. Christianity* (Lond., Washbourne), c. xx; Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, tr. from 3rd ed. of *Les Origines* (Lond. 1903).

(*B*) CONFIRMATION IN THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH

In the Eastern Orthodox Church the second of the seven sacraments takes the form of anointing. It is known among the Greek-speaking Churches as "Chrisma," or sometimes "Myron," or, again, "Bebaiosis." The Slavonic name is "Miropomazanie."

The sacrament of Chrism is administered immediately after Baptism, following the latter without a break, so that to the casual observer it might appear to be part of the same service.

The child having been baptized and reclothed, the rite of Chrism begins with an ascription of praise and thanksgiving to God for the baptismal gift, merging into a prayer for the gift of Confirmation—for "the seal of the gift of thy holy, and almighty, and adorable Spirit." The child is then anointed in the sign of the Cross, on the brow, the eyes, the nostrils, the lips, the ears, the breast, the hands, and the feet; and at each anointing the priest says: "The Seal of the Gift of the Holy Spirit. Amen." A triple circuit of the font is then made with lighted tapers by the clergy, accompanied by the sponsors carrying the child. The circle thus made in procession symbolizes the unbroken character of the eternal union with Christ entered upon by the recipient of the sacrament.

There follow some Versicles and Responses, and the Epistle to the Romans, ch. vi. 3–11, is recited by the Reader. After a few more Versicles and Responses the priest reads the Gospel, St. Matt. xxviii. verses 16 to 20. A Litany and Blessing may follow, but the service usually ends with the Gospel, and "Glory to Thee, O Lord, Glory to Thee."

The chrism used is prepared from olive oil and balsam, with which a large variety of other ingredients is mixed in small quantities. The number of these secondary constituents is a matter of custom. In Russia there are some forty, in Constantinople even more. The preparation takes place in Holy Week, the actual blessing of the Chrism being on Maundy Thursday, and a little of that which has been previously blessed is added to the new Chrism. The right to consecrate the chrism is the prerogative of the Œcumenical Patriarch, who performs the ceremony every few years as required. The prerogative is regarded as a symbol of the primatial dignity of the patriarchal throne of Constantinople, whose occupant is the *primus inter pares* of the bishops of the Eastern Orthodox Church. From Constantinople the chrism is distributed to the rest of the Orthodox world, and thus it becomes a symbol also of their unity of life and faith. The Œcumenical Patriarch has, however, conceded the right to consecrate the chrism for its own use to the Church of Russia, where the ceremony is performed either at Moscow or at Kiev; and, since the schism between Bulgaria and Constantinople in 1870, the Church of Bulgaria has received the chrism from Moscow. The chrism is distributed to the parishes, and normally kept, together with the instruments required for its use, in a silver box on the altar, near the receptacle which contains the Blessed Sacrament.

The Sacrament of Chrism is administered by the priest, in whom the authority to do so is inherent in virtue of his ordination. "The consecration of the Myrrh belongs from ancient customs to the bishop, its administration to the priest."

Chrism is identified with the laying on of hands for the bestowal of the Holy Spirit recorded in the New Testament (*e.g.* Acts viii and xix). The most general explanation given for the change of outward sign is that probably towards the end of the Apostolic Age the use of chrism was substituted for the laying on of hands because the Apostles found themselves unable to cope with the increasing number of people scattered over a widespread area, to whom the sacrament had to be given.

It is taught that chrism is " the divinely instituted rite by which the bodily members of the baptized person are anointed, and his incipient spiritual life strengthened and perfected " (Dyobouniotes, quoted in Gavin, *Greek Orthodox Thought*, p. 316). It is the completion of Holy Baptism, and in it the spiritual life of the baptized person is, by the reception of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, strengthened and equipped for the conflict against temptation. The gifts of the Spirit are sometimes classified as those of Isaiah xi, and sometimes according to the list in Gal. v. 22.

It is as the complement of Baptism that Chrism follows immediately upon it. And Eastern Orthodox theologians regard the Western custom of postponing Confirmation for some years not only as at variance with tradition, but also as illogical. If infants are capable of receiving the grace of Baptism, why not also that of Confirmation ? And why should the West have departed from primitive custom in this respect ?

There is not space in this note to enter into the question of the Orthodox view of such essentially Western terms as " validity " and " character " as applied to sacraments. A discussion of the subject may be found in chapter v of Dr. Gavin's book already quoted. But it should be said that in the East it is held that Chrism, like Baptism and Holy Orders, cannot be administered twice to the same recipient. It is true that the Roumanian Archbishop Schaguna writes that the sacrament is administered " to those who have fallen away from our Church and gone over to another Christian Church, and then returned to the bosom of our Orthodoxy." But the Russian and Greek theologians are emphatic on the point that Chrism is not to be repeated upon one who has already been chrismated, even if in the interval he have lapsed into schism, heresy, or unbelief, and now desires to return to the Church. Nevertheless, it appears that penitents returning from schism are anointed with chrism, at least in some parts of the Orthodox Church. But the Greek theologians explain carefully that this is in no sense a repetition of the sacrament of Chrism. It is a service for the readmission of penitents. "This intinction with Myrrh has never been considered as an iteration of the sacrament, but is, as it were, the re-dedication of the new life of those returning to Orthodoxy, by the prayers and blessings of the Church and the invocation of the Holy Spirit" (Androutsos, quoted by Gavin).

The sacrament of Chrism is to be distinguished also from the anointing of Orthodox Princes at their coronation. This is usually regarded as something entirely different. But Nechaev (the standard text-book in Russian seminaries, and work of reference for the Russian clergy in matters of Canon Law) has the following interesting comment upon it—"it is neither a special (eighth) sacrament, nor a repetition of the sacrament of Chrism (just as the sacrament of Orders is not repeated in the consecration of a bishop), but is only a special aspect, or, so to speak, the highest grade of it."

CHAPTER VI

THE RELATION OF CONFIRMATION TO BAPTISM

By K. D. Mackenzie

The relation of Confirmation to the Sacrament of Holy Baptism is a matter which has been referred to incidentally more than once in the course of this book; but the importance and difficulty of the subject seems to demand a brief separate treatment.

The opinions actually held may be divided into two groups, according to the view taken of the effect of Baptism itself.

I. It may be believed that in Baptism not only is the soul forgiven, regenerated, and united to the Body of Christ by the action of the Holy Spirit, but also that it is actually and personally indwelt by the same Holy Spirit.

In this case Confirmation may be thought of—

(*a*) As the gift of a closer union between the Holy Spirit and the soul;
(*b*) As the bestowal of growth and stability;
(*c*) As an outpouring of further gifts of the Spirit, without the setting up of any new interior relationship between the Spirit and the human soul.

II. The other possible view of the effect of Baptism is that, while it bestows regeneration and forgiveness of sins, joins us to the Body of Christ, and gives a share of His Divine and Human Natures, all these gifts are to be thought of as actions of the Holy Spirit from without, His personal indwelling being reserved for the moment of Confirmation. The gifts of Baptism are *preliminary*; they may be compared to the making ready of a temple for consecration; but the actual reception of the Divine Inhabitant does not take place until Baptism is completed by Confirmation.

Of these views I (*a*) has been commonly held in the

Anglican Communion by the upholders of the sacramental doctrine of Confirmation: it was the view of the Tractarian Fathers; and it seems to be implied by the Eastern service-books; I (*b*) is the doctrine of St. Thomas and the Council of Trent; I (*c*) was maintained by Dr. Theodore Wirgman,[1] who does not seem to have secured many adherents to the exact position upheld by him. II has in modern times been associated principally with the names of Dr. Mason[2] and Fr. Puller, S.S.J.E.[3]; but both these theologians maintain that it is the primitive doctrine, and that modern Western theology has been untrue both to Holy Scripture and the Fathers in assigning to Baptism what is, in fact, the distinctive grace of Confirmation.

It will be noticed that the acuteness of the difficulty arises from the fact that the Western Church has, rightly or wrongly, departed from the original custom of conferring the two sacraments in close conjunction. What would in primitive days have been an academical question has become a matter on which every priest who prepares a child for Baptism or Confirmation must try to make up his mind. For the question cannot fail to arise, In what state is the soul of one who has been baptized, but not yet confirmed? Are we to say to our candidates for Confirmation, "You have not yet received the Holy Spirit?" And the very fact that the separation of the two sacraments is not primitive introduces a certain precariousness into the appeal to primitive language on the subject. It is easy to produce any number of authorities for the view that the Holy Spirit is bestowed in Baptism; but it is always possible for the upholders of the second opinion to answer that no primitive writer ever dreamed of dissociating Baptism from Confirmation. Dr. Mason goes so far as to say that Baptism and Confirmation are as much parts of the same sacrament as the consecrated Bread and Wine are parts of the one sacrament of the Holy Eucharist; and arguments based on the language of the Scriptures and of the Fathers begin to remind us of those discussions on the doctrine of Concomitance which are based on the question whether St. Paul wrote "and" or "or" in 1 Cor. xi. 27.

---

[1] *The Doctrine of Confirmation considered in Relation to Holy Baptism as a Sacramental Ordinance of the Catholic Church.*

[2] *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism.*

[3] *What is the Distinctive Grace of Confirmation?*

It is interesting to notice that the argument from primitive practice led Fr. Puller and Dr. Mason to very opposite practical conclusions. Fr. Puller desires (or desired) to restore the practice of Infant Confirmation and Communion, while Dr. Mason considered that if the argument were to be pressed in this direction it would be better to defer Baptism than to anticipate Confirmation.

Now it is acknowledged on all sides that Holy Scripture and the Fathers do speak of Baptism as the means whereby the Holy Spirit is given. We have the words of St. Peter on the day of Pentecost: "Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts ii. 38). And St. Paul: "In one Spirit were we all baptized into one body . . . and were all made to drink of one Spirit" (1 Cor. xii. 13). And again: "He saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Tit. iii. 5).

So, coming to the Fathers, we have St. Cyprian stating that "By means of Baptism the Holy Spirit is received."[1] St. Augustine plainly identifies Baptism with the giving of the Holy Spirit.[2] St. Jerome states that "there is no Baptism without the Holy Spirit."[3] These are merely instances: the list might be lengthened manifold.

The upholders of the second view, however, certainly make out a very strong case for their contention.

In regard to the scriptural evidence, there is one passage which states expressly that the Samaritan converts, baptized, but not yet confirmed, had *not* received the Holy Ghost. "As yet He was fallen upon none of them, only they were baptized." "Then laid they their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost." And again, "Through laying on of the Apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given" (Acts viii. 16–18). In the incident of Acts xix. 1-6 it is quite clear that it was not until St. Paul had laid his hands upon those whom he had baptized that the Holy Ghost fell on them.

---

[1] *Ep.* lxiii. 8.

[2] *De Bapt. c. Donat.* v. 28.

[3] *Adv. Lucifer.* iv. 292.

So, when we come to the Fathers, we find passages which seem clearly to assert that the personal indwelling of the Holy Ghost is the result of Confirmation rather than of Baptism. Thus St. Irenæus quite clearly attributes the unspiritual character of St. Paul's Corinthian converts to their not having received, as he supposes, the laying on of hands.[1] St. Augustine is equally definite. "When you were exorcized, it was the grinding of you. When you were baptized, it was your moistening. When you received the fire of the Holy Ghost, it was the baking of you."[2] And parallel passages show very definitely that this "fire of the Holy Ghost" was given through the chrism of Confirmation. So also he distinguishes between being "born of the Spirit," which is Baptism, and "feeding of the Spirit," which is Confirmation.[3] So again the Pope Cornelius writes, with reference to Novatian, who had been baptized in sickness, but had neglected to obtain "the remaining things which a man ought to partake of according to Church rule, and was never sealed by the Bishop, How could he have obtained the Holy Ghost?"[4]

So St. Ambrose (if Dr. Mason is right in assuming the *de Sacramentis* to be from his hand) definitely asserts: "After the font it remains that the perfecting be done, when, in response to the bishop's invocation, the Holy Ghost is poured upon you."[5]

Further, Dr. Mason would turn the flank of his opponents by asserting that in the usage of the primitive Church the idea of Baptism, whenever it is associated with the gift of the Holy Ghost, invariably *includes* what we know as Confirmation, and that a frequent patristic usage was to employ the actual word Baptism to include the laying on of hands. For the second part of this assertion he certainly brings very strong evidence. Thus, in speaking of Baptism, Tertullian says: "Man receives that Spirit of God," but at once goes on: "Not that we obtain the Holy Spirit in the waters, but, having been cleansed in the water, we are there prepared for the Holy Spirit. . . . After that (*i.e.* after anointing) the hand is laid upon us in benediction, invoking and inviting the Holy Ghost."[1] So he points out that St. Cyprian plainly teaches that the effect of Baptism is that "a man is made fit to receive the Holy Ghost," and deduces that if this is to be made consistent with his statement, already quoted, that "by means of Baptism the Holy Spirit is received," "Baptism" in this latter passage must be held to include the imposition of hands.

---

[1] *Hær.* iv. 63.

[2] *Serm.* cclxxi.

[3] *Serm.* lxxi. 19, 33.

[4] *Ap.* Eus. *Eccl. Hist.* vi. 43.

[5] *de Sacr.* iii. ii. 8.

On the other hand, St. Jerome's statements seem to resist the attempt to evacuate them of their apparent meaning. And in regard to many of the definite statements of the Fathers as to the reception of the Holy Spirit in "Baptism," it has to be pointed out that the emphasis is laid on the symbolism of *washing* in a way which certainly suggests that what they were thinking of was the rite which *we* know as Baptism, although of course it remains true that in practice the washing, the anointing, and the laying on of hands were almost always given in close connexion.[2] Thus Origen does not actually say "He who is baptized received the Holy Spirit," but "He who is *washed unto salvation* received both the water and the Holy Spirit."[3] St. Athanasius connects the gift of the Holy Spirit with "the *laver* of regeneration."[4] St. Cyril of Jerusalem refers to "the seal" of the Holy Spirit being bestowed "by means of *water*."[5]

On the whole, we must say that the matter cannot be finally decided on evidence of this kind: the scriptural evidence is indeterminate. Acts viii. 16 is indeed very strongly in favour of the view of Dr. Mason and Fr. Puller: but the very fact that this passage distinguishes so strongly between "Baptism" and the "Laying on of hands" suggests that the usage of the apostolic Church was *not* to include both rites under the single name of "Baptism"; and therefore that the passages in the New

---

[1] *de Bapt.* vi.

[2] "*Almost* always," for St. Cyprian mentions the case of those who were baptized in sickness and not confirmed. It is to be noticed that he asserts of such persons that "the Holy Spirit is poured upon them in His fulness" (*Ep.* lxix. 15).

[3] *In Ezech. Hom.*, vi. 5.

[4] *Ep. ad Serap.* i. 4.

[5] *Cat. Myst.* ii. 4.

Testament, and especially in Acts, which define the gift of "Baptism," mean by that term *only* the "laver of regeneration," and not the subsequent laying on of hands.

Further there can be little doubt that St. Paul believed himself to have received the Holy Spirit by the Baptism of water alone; and although it is true that Ananias did lay hands upon him, yet this was obviously connected with the restoration of his sight rather than with the gift of the Holy Spirit.[1] To maintain that Ananias *confirmed* him would imply that he had the apostolic authority to confirm, of which there is no evidence, and (2) that Confirmation can be administered *before* Baptism. Every reference to Baptism and the laying on of hands in Holy Scripture *except* Acts viii. 16 is patient of the interpretation that the Holy Spirit is given both in the former and (in greater fulness) in the latter. How much weight we must attach to the exception may perhaps depend on our view of inspiration in general, and in particular on the significance for our present purpose of the lack of distinctively *theological* interest occasionally to be detected in St. Luke.[2]

The evidence of the Fathers also on the whole seems to be indeterminate, though indeed the balance inclines towards the view of Dr. Mason and Fr. Puller. It is perhaps too much to expect complete unanimity in what for them was, as has been said, little more than an academic question. It has been suggested that there was what we might call a North African School of thought, represented for us by Tertullian and St. Cyprian, and, presumably, St. Augustine, which emphasized Confirmation as the moment of the bestowal of the Spirit; though indeed, as we have seen, St. Cyprian is not always quite consistent with himself.

It remains to consider more modern authorities. It will have been noticed that St. Thomas and the Council of Trent have been placed under a separate heading in the subdivision with which this article began. The distinctive feature of the scholastic and Tridentine doctrine is the emphasis on the ideas of *growth* and *maturity*. It is obvious that this teaching implies a condition of things in which an interval between the two sacraments has become the accepted and normal custom. "The difference," says the Catechism of the Council, "which there is in the natural life between generation and growth, is the same as that between Baptism, which has the effect of regenerating, and Confirmation, by virtue of which the faithful develop, and attain, perfect strength of soul. Besides, inasmuch as a new and distinct kind of sacrament ought to be appointed when the soul incurs a new difficulty, it can easily be seen that, as we need the grace of Baptism for the formation of the mind by faith, so it is exceedingly profitable that souls should be confirmed by another grace, in order that they may not be deterred from the confession of the true faith by any danger or dread of pains or penalties or death."[1]

---

[1] Acts ix. 17, 18; xxii. 12, 16.

[2] It is sometimes maintained by modern scholars that Acts viii. 14-20 and xix. 1-7, have nothing to do with Confirmation at all, but merely refer to the outpouring of miraculous gifts of the Spirit. This is an approximation to Dr. Wirgman's view, though commonly urged from a very different theological standpoint.

The Council was undoubtedly swayed in its discussions on the subject by the supreme authority of St. Thomas; but, unfortunately, it appears that that doctor was himself unduly influenced by an important passage in the Forged Decretals, which, as is well known, were universally accepted in the thirteenth century as genuine Papal pronouncements of the time of Constantine. It seems, moreover, that St. Thomas was not only deceived as to the origin of the document, but also misapprehended the meaning of the word *augmentum*. In the original the word appears to mean simply "an addition": St. Thomas interpreted it in the sense of "growth." "In this sacrament," he says, "is given the fulness of the Holy Ghost for spiritual strength, which belongs to perfect age."[2] In this misapprehension the Western Church generally followed him.

Oriental teaching appears to show as little unanimity as that of the great Fathers. An orthodox confession accepted by all the Eastern Patriarchs in 1643[3] states that: "As by Baptism we are regenerated, so by the Holy Unction we are made partakers of the Holy Ghost, being confirmed in

[1] Cat. Trid. de Sacr. Confirm. 4. Dr. Mason's translation.

[2] *S.T.* III. lxii. 1.

[3] The Catechism of Peter Inagila.

the faith of the Lord, and grow in divine grace."[1] So in more modern times Bishop Macarius states that "In Baptism we are only purified and regenerated by the virtue of the Holy Ghost, but we are not yet fit to receive that Spirit in ourselves and to become His temples." On the other hand, as Dr. Darwell Stone points out,[2] the Synod of Bethlehem described the baptized as the temples of God, and the Greek Baptismal Office uses in reference to Baptism the expression "having guarded the gift of Thy Holy Spirit."

Finally, it may be well to see if our own Book of Common Prayer will help us to a decision. Fortunately or unfortunately, we have again no clear guidance. On the one hand, the ancient prayer which is the "form" of Confirmation suggests that the candidates are regenerate and forgiven, but not yet partakers of the Holy Ghost; but, on the other, the words of the baptismal office speak quite clearly of God "giving His Holy Spirit" to the candidate, "that he may be born again, and be made an heir of everlasting salvation," and in the case of adult candidates, bids us not to doubt that He will not only "grant them remission of their sins," but also "bestow upon them the Holy Ghost."

In declining to come to a definite conclusion on the evidence before us, we may perhaps take refuge in the thought that in theology, which is always an attempt to translate the things of God into the language of men, antinomies are seldom such that we can be sure that they defy solution. Very often it is rather a question as to what is the best way of stating the facts of faith than as to what those facts ultimately are, and two statements which are verbally contradictory may really be only a better and a less good way of saying the same thing.

It may be, then, that our question really is this: Can it be a satisfactory way of stating what we all believe on the subject of Baptism to say that in that sacrament a man is indeed vitally united to the Body of Christ, but *not* to Him who is "the Spirit of Jesus"? Great theological authorities in ancient and modern times alike have so spoken, but is it the best way of expressing the truth? Is it at all tolerable to say, with Fr. Puller, that the member of Christ has *not* had imparted to him the indwelling presence of the Spirit of Christ? So Dr. Bright said, "It is hard to see how the recipient of Baptism, as such . . . could be 'in' Christ, yet not 'in' the Holy Spirit; could be incorporated into the body mystical, yet not really inhabited by the 'Giver of life,' Who is the very informing and vitalizing principle of that body."[1] Surely it is extraordinarily difficult to make such language real to ourselves. Again, is it consistent with the general theology of the Holy Spirit to speak of Him as operating and working on the soul without some measure at least of an indwelling presence? If we are compelled to use such language by the cogency of Holy Scripture and the primitive Church, we must no doubt bow to authority; but it hardly seems to be a way of stating the case which commends itself naturally to the Catholic mind. Dr. Mason uses the analogy of the two parts of the Holy Eucharist. "Confirmation," he says, "is only a separate sacrament, in the same kind of way as the Eucharistic Chalice might be called a separate sacrament from the Eucharistic Bread." But if this analogy is to be pressed, it seems to bring us to the opposite conclusion from that reached by Dr. Mason.

---

[1] See Mason, *Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, pp. 415-421.

[2] *Holy Baptism*, p. 83.

For, however strongly we may believe that there are separate graces attached to the two parts of the Holy Eucharist, it can hardly be maintained that they act in a different way, or even that ultimately That which is received under the one form is separated from That which is received under the other. Under either form there is received after the manner of food Christ Himself, whole and entire. Normally the reception of both species is commanded, but it would not be true to say that a person who had received one species and not the other was in a wholly different spiritual condition from one who had received both. So, under this analogy, we should be drawn to the conclusion that the gifts of Baptism and Confirmation are essentially similar, and that although by precept, and for edification, and also for the fulness of grace, it is normally necessary to receive both parts of the one ordinance, yet the soul which is prevented from receiving both does not sustain a fatal wound, or find itself totally deprived of a constituent part of the heritage of eternal life.

---

[1] Bright, *Morality in Doctrine.*

More helpful than the Eucharistic analogy seems to be the suggestion that in Baptism-Confirmation the former part is negative, the cleansing from sin, the latter positive, the reception of the Holy Ghost. But on such a statement it would seem to follow that regeneration and membership in Christ belong to the latter member of the composite sacrament, and Baptism would be resolved into nothing more than an Absolution from sin. This is certainly a conclusion from which the upholders of the view of Dr. Mason and Fr. Puller would shrink; and, indeed, it seems impossible to reconcile it with our Lord's language in St. John iii. 5. "Water and the Spirit," in that passage, must surely be taken, not as two separate ordinances, but as the outward and inward parts of a single sacrament. Otherwise we should have evacuated Baptism with water of all spiritual content whatever, and transferred the whole weight of importance to the laying on of hands.

It seems also to be worth saying that, after all, Baptism is a word with a certain etymological meaning, and that we cannot help entertaining some suspicion against a view which seems to imply that the principal graces which the Apostles and the Fathers associate with *βάπτισμα* have nothing to do with *βάπτεσθαι*. And, however strongly we may believe that imposition of hands, or unction, or both, were among the instructions given by our Lord to His Apostles, it cannot be denied that His *recorded* command was to *baptize*, and that on His lips Baptism must have meant baptism with water, and cannot have included the supplementary rites. In some features of the patristic teaching there does therefore seem to be a certain danger of attributing to the lesser sacrament a higher potency than to that directly instituted by our Lord; and that this is not an imaginary danger may be inferred from a remark quoted with approval by Archbishop Benson in his *Primary Charge*: "Confirmation seems more present to the earliest Christian habits of thought than Baptism itself."

CHAPTER VII

THE THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF CONFIRMATION

By H. Maurice Relton

SUMMARY

1. Confirmation: the Outward Act and the Inward Effect.
2. The "Spirit" in Modern Philosophy.
3. Postulates of a Christian Philosophy.
4. The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit.
5. Grace and Human Personality.
    (*a*) Infant Baptism.
    (*b*) Faith.
6. (*a*) Grace and Faith.
    (*b*) The Sacraments in the Church System.
7. The Sacramental Principle.
    (*a*) In Nature.
    (*b*) In the Church System.
    (*c*) In Human Life.
    (*d*) The Real Presence.
    (*e*) The Conception of "Purpose" in Sacramental Grace.
8. (*a*) Spirit and Matter.
    (*b*) The "Laying on of Hands."
9. (*a*) Practical Significance of Confirmation.
    (*b*) Its Bearing and Importance in the Christian Life.
10. Conclusion.

[A consideration of the meaning and practical value of the rite and its position and place within the whole circle of Christian teaching; its relation to Baptism and the Eucharist; the Doctrine of Divine Transcendence and Immanence in contrast to philosophical immanentism; the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity; the place and Office of the Holy Ghost in the Divine Economy; the Personality of God the Holy Ghost and His work in regeneration and sanctification; the Christian doctrine of Grace; Grace in relation to human personality; Grace and freedom. The method of the Divine

work in us; the sacramental system and the place of Confirmation as a sacramental ordinance; the means of Grace and the Sacramental Principle, in Nature, in the Church system, in human life; the practical significance of Confirmation and its importance in the Christian life.]

I. Introduction: Confirmation, the Outward Act and the Inward Effect

The foregoing historical survey yields data from which we may deduce the theological implications involved in the rite of Confirmation. Our task is to consider this teaching in its place within the whole circle of Christian truth, and to draw out the significance and value of it in its practical bearing on the life of the baptized member of the Church.

In the first place, clearly, Confirmation is intimately related to both Baptism and the Eucharist. In the Anglican Church it is the completion of one great sacrament and the entrance to the other. It finds its place within the sacramental system, and, whether regarded as a sacramental ordinance or a sacrament strictly so called (a point dependent entirely upon the definition given to the term "sacrament"), it is both in the Eastern and Western Church closely bound up with the conception of grace, and particularly with sacramental grace in the Church's system.

A glance at the names given to the rite in Christian history and the words used in the various Confirmation services, and in the literature of both East and West, reveals the nature both of the outward act and of the inward effect of the ordinance.

It is called "the laying on of hands," "chrism," "unction," "seal," "pledge," with reference to the outward act; it is named, in its result, "confirmation," "perfection," and "the fulness of wealth." Again, with reference both to outward act and inward effect, we find it called "the sacrament of the plenitude of Grace," "the chrism of Salvation," "the seal of Life Eternal," "the spiritual seal," "the seal of the Lord," "the mystery of unguent," and "the seal whereby the Holy Ghost is received."

We have thus the "*chrism*," mysterious, sacramental, holy, healthful, tending to salvation; the "*seal*" with the four pledges of life eternal, spirituality, the signature of the Lord, the gift of the Holy Ghost. We have, further, in the thought of "*perfection*," the complement of Baptism; the prize of perseverance; the reward of the brave soldier; and again, in the "*fulness of wealth*," the thought of the unsearchable riches of Christ bestowed upon the believer in communion with God, mediated through sacramental grace; and finally, in "*Confirmation*," there is the thought of the augmentation of spiritual strength; the pledge of security; boldness in confession of faith; resolution in purpose; vigour in action; steadfastness under trial.

All this is admirably brought out in a little-known manual on the History of Confirmation, published in 1877, in which the writer deals with the grace of Confirmation in words which cannot be bettered, and which we will quote as a starting-point for our inquiry into the doctrinal implications of the rite. What are simple persons to look for when they come to be confirmed? The answer clearly is that they are to look for those gifts which are asked for on their behalf in the prayers of the Church, viz.:

"The Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and ghostly strength, the Spirit of knowledge and true godliness, and the Spirit of God's holy fear." They are to expect, this writer tells us:

"'The gift of the Holy Ghost'; the soul-pervading influence of the Spirit, the inward comfort and guidance of the third person of the Godhead; the subtle influence of God's Spirit upon the spirit of man made in His image; the warmth of Divine love, kindling the purest affections of man's heart; the divine wisdom ennobling the higher spiritual powers of the reason; the infusion of larger and purer knowledge; the practical guidance of the Spirit of counsel, helping man to form true judgments, in cases of apparently conflicting duties; the inspiration of reverence" —these (he tells us) "are the inward life and grace of Confirmation."

A glance at the testimony of patristic and scholastic authorities will show us the greatness of the claim consistently made through the ages concerning the inward effect of Confirmation on the spiritual life of the recipient. To take but a few typical examples, which could easily be multiplied in any century of the Church's history, the great St. Thomas Aquinas tells us that "there is a plenitude of grace sufficient for salvation, and this is given in Baptism; and there is a plenitude of grace for strong resistance, and this is given in Confirmation."[1]

Again, Peter Lombard, in the *Sentences*, informs us that "the virtue of this sacrament is the gift of the Holy Spirit for strength, who was given in Baptism for the remission of sins."[2]

Bonaventura crystallizes this concept in a pregnant phrase, "Confirmatio Sacramentum est pugnantium"—Confirmation is the Sacrament of Warriors. In fact, it is possible to find a catena of passages from writers in every century bearing witness to the Church's unwavering belief in the reception of divine grace through the rite of Confirmation. Whilst it is true that, so far as the outward act is concerned, there are conflicting opinions as to whether the "laying on of hands," or the application of the "chrism," be the essential *materia* of the sacrament—again, as regards this last, what precisely is the composition of the *materia* and by whom must it be consecrated?—yet, broadly speaking, whether by laying on of hands, by chrism only, or by both, whether by bishop or by presbyters employing chrism consecrated by the bishop—all are agreed that the rite conveys divine grace and traces its sanction back to Apostolic times (*vide* the work quoted above, *passim*). A sentence from Augustine sums up the voice of the Church, ancient and modern:

> "Not by gifts of tongues is the presence of the Spirit known, in the laying on of hands, but invisibly and secretly, it is felt. The in-breathing of divine charity in the bond

---

[1] Aquinas, 4. d. 7. q. 2. ad 1: "Est plenitudo gratiæ sufficiens ad salutem, et hoc datur in Baptismo; et plenitudo gratiæ ad fortiter resistendum, et hoc datur in Confirmatione."

[2] "Virtus hujus sacramenti est Donatio Spiritus Sancti, ad robur, Qui in Baptismo datus est ad remissionem" (Lombard, *Sententiarum*, lib. iv. dist. vii. p. 382).

of peace enables them to say, 'The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given us.'"[1]

Here, then, is a claim made by the Church consistently almost from its foundation down to the present time, and it constitutes a challenge to thought and invites attention from both the theological and the wider philosophical standpoint.

Is such a phenomenon capable of intellectual justification at the bar of reason? Is it to be relegated to the sphere of Church superstition, and to find its place with other quasi-magical rites, to which the Church is supposed to cling tenaciously in spite of the fact that our age has long ago left childish superstitions behind in the fuller knowledge gained by the advance of science? Can any room be found for the rite of Confirmation in a philosophical treatment of theistic belief?

These are questions we must bear in mind in our inquiry. It is obvious that the justification of Confirmation is bound up with the larger problems centring round the whole doctrine of the Divine Grace in relation to human personality; the doctrine of the Holy Ghost as a Person of the Trinity; the vindication of Trinitarianism as against modern philosophical immanentism; the place and significance of the sacramental principle in the Church's belief; and even the wider problem of the objective validity of religious experience, and, in particular, the specific Christian experience of God in Christ Jesus.

II. The "Spirit" in Modern Philosophy

We may clear the ground to a certain extent, to start with, by admitting that at present there is little if any room in modern philosophical systems for a doctrine of the Holy Ghost. It is doubtful if philosophy will ever succeed in giving us anything but a purely immanent God. We find reference in various tendencies of modern philosophical thought to the concept of "Spirit," or even to the thought of "the Spirit," conceived of as immanently active in the cosmos, or as the sustaining principle and ground of all that is; none the less, all such speculation is at bottom pantheistic, and involves a refusal to take Christian Theism seriously. There is a failure to do justice to religious experience of a God at once transcendent above, and immanent in, His creation, and yet at the same time unconfused in any pantheistic sense with any part of it. Consequently, there is no room for a doctrine of the Holy Ghost in a purely immanentist philosophy, and we must needs construct a distinctively Christian philosophy, with its own postulates and concepts, to do justice to the data afforded by Christian religious experience and revelation of God in Christ Jesus. Such a distinctive Christian philosophy must stand or fall on its own merits, in rivalry with other philosophical systems, as the best explanation of the cosmic problem. There is room in such a Christian system for a doctrine of the Holy Ghost such as will commend itself as a reasonable and intelligible concept in the doctrinal system of the Church.

---

[1] Quis enim nunc hoc expectat, ut ii quibus manus ad accipiendum Spiritum Sanctum imponitur, repente incipiant linguis loqui? Sed invisibiliter et latenter intelligitur propter vinculum pacis eorum cordibus divina charitas inspirari, ut possint dicere, Quoniam charitas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per Spiritum Sanctum, qui datus est nobis. (*De Bapt. contr. Donat.* c. xvi.)

III. Postulates of a Christian Philosophy

We must start with certain postulates of a Christian philosophy, the defence and elaboration of which I have already presented in a series of articles in *Theology*.[1]

We must sketch, as briefly as possible, the function and place of the Holy Spirit in the divine economy. We maintain that the Christian conception of God is that of a Unity in Trinity; that the Christian experience of God in Christ Jesus confirms the revelation of God in both Old and New Testaments as that of a personal God, all-holy, omnipotent Love. Further, that in Christian communion we are in living vital contact with One Who is transcendent above His creation, and immanent in it; not as being in any pantheistic sense identical with any part of it, and yet "closer than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet"; further, that there is an eternal distinction between Creator and created which constitutes an ontological difference between the two, and involves the proposition that what God is in Himself, in His inmost being, must ever transcend our finite powers of apprehension. That, none the less, He can reveal Himself to us within the limits of our finite capacity of receptivity ; and, again, that the possibility of such a revelation follows from the fact that, whilst we are not parts of Himself in any pantheistic sense, yet there is an affinity between us and God due to the fact of creation. Because He made us in His image, human personality is a dim adumbration of the Divine, and is so fashioned as to be capable of responding to the call of its Maker and recognizing the Author of its being. Kinship and affinity do not involve identity of essence. Like can know like, and deep can respond to deep. " Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless until they find rest in Thee."

---

[1] March 1921 onwards; see also my work, *Some Postulates of a Christian Philosophy* (S.P.C.K. 1926).

Hence our destiny is bound up with God, and our human nature ever incomplete without Him. God in us is the truth of us. We need the Spirit of God in us for the completion of our truest selves. When He made us He had an ideal self in view for each one. The purpose of His Divine love was that we should grow up into His likeness. The principle of individuality secures that no two persons are identical. God's purpose in our creation and completion is not the fashioning of two souls into an identically ideal self, but that each individual soul should be the revelation of one particular aspect of His glory—no two souls revealing in identically the same way the same glory. Hence the need of a realm of finite and glorified spirits for the revelation of His fulness to the extent to which the glory of the Highest can be fully revealed in the sons of men. Human personality is thus seen to be in the making. We are in process of becoming, and it is not yet manifest what we shall be. It is clear, however, that our becoming is intimately bound up with Him and in Him. It is He that hath made us, and not we ourselves. Our fashioning is a work He purposes to do for us and in us. It is a work we cannot do without Him, and yet which He cannot do in us without our consent. It is something which He must do for us ; which none the less we must do for ourselves; which is to be His work in us and at the same time our work in Him. This raises the whole problem of the relation of grace and human personality, which we must face later.

Further that sin, rebellion against God, was the risk He had to take if we were to achieve His purpose for our lives; in this sense, that the miracle of finite human personality lies in the fact that He has conferred upon us a measure of human freedom and independence. We are "created creators." This is our glory and our shame. To man alone, the climax of created beings in time and space, has been granted such a measure of free will as to enable him to work out God's purpose for him, viz. the achievement of ethical and spiritual personality. So doing and becoming, man is able to grow up after the likeness of his Maker. God's character being Holy Love, and His values Truth, Goodness, and Beauty, He wills to see a realm of finite selves achieving in their measure these values as the result of a moral and spiritual probation. These values cannot, in the nature of things as God has made them, be achieved without freedom to accept or reject the highest when seen. The ethical efficacy of an act lies in its voluntary character, and with this last is bound up its intrinsic worth. We are free within the limits of our finite nature, environment, and God's eternal purpose for the whole realm of created beings and the universe, to achieve something in the realm of the real. In so doing we are to win eternal life, since the touch of the eternal and abiding rests upon those ideals of truth, goodness, beauty, love, etc., after which we must needs strive and struggle as the response to the dictates of a nature He has bestowed upon us in creation. Because He is in Himself these ideals, and we are made after His image, we are so constituted that we must strive to reach up to these supra-temporal realities, transcendent above us and yet immanent in us. They are not imposed upon us from outside as alien to our nature, but are the truth of every one of us as God designed us, and as He wills that we shall become. Hence the condition of our well-being is that we respond willingly to the call of the deepest in us, which is Himself revealed to the human heart. "We needs must love the highest when we see it."

Now our freedom to achieve this end involves also our freedom to reject what is for our eternal welfare and to choose the lower temporal values as inferior substitutes. We are great enough to cause our own damnation. This is a condition of all possibility of achievement in the realm of the ethical and spiritual in the relationship between the human spirit of man and the Divine Spirit of the Almighty. We can and do sin against the light, and so doing sin against ourselves. Hence arises the problem of redemption. The turning away of the spirit of man from God involves the terrible possibility of man's missing the destiny God designed for him. Apart from all question as to the origin of evil in the world, the fact of sin as rebellion against God is undeniably present to the awakened conscience. It is a dread experience of the religious life, with its accompaniments of alienation, the sense of guilt, estrangement, loss; the felt need of reconciliation as the sole condition of spiritual health, and the consciousness of inability to make atonement. Those nearest to God and in closest touch with His ideals are most painfully conscious of failure, imperfection, and loss. Hence the paradox of the greatest saints in Christian history having acknowledged themselves to be the chiefest sinners. The clearer the vision of God, the deeper the sense of unworthiness and failure—the deeper the felt need for the divine aid to "rise on stepping-stones of our dead selves to higher things." This is the witness in Christian experience at once to our greatness and the seemingly unlimited capacity of our higher becoming on the one hand, and on the other to our dependence upon our Maker for His grace and salvation, failing which we must sink in the scale of being and fall short of His eternal purpose of love concerning us. In this great and ominous prevalence of sin, and the fact of a sinful race falling short of its divine end, fallen from its high estate, lies the justification and the glory of the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation.

The place of revelation and redemption in the Christian religion is fundamental. The Christian theist postulates revelation on the assumption that there is a God, a living, personal Being, able and willing to reveal Himself to men, who likewise are able and capable of an intelligent appreciation of what is disclosed by God to their finite understanding. The claim made for the Christian revelation of God in Christ Jesus is not that the finite creature has thus been enabled to know the whole Being of the Almighty, but that he has been granted sufficient knowledge for life and its purposes as God conceives these in the light of His saving purpose for man. We know as much about God in His relationship to the world and to the individual soul as is sufficient for our guidance and for our intelligent co-operation with Him in the working out of His revealed purpose for our lives. Christian experience witnesses to the fact of saving grace available for the believer as the result of the Incarnation and work of Christ. A pragmatic test justifies our faith that God has indeed visited and redeemed His people ; that He has sent His Son both as Revealer of Himself and as Saviour of men. God is revealed as Saviour, coming forth in the fulness of time " to seek and to save that which was lost." In this divine action is revealed the infinite preciousness of the human child in the eyes of the Divine Father. The Incarnation reveals the Father at work in the Son for the redemption of mankind. The result is an insight into the character of God unparalleled in human history, and charged with momentous consequences for the whole human race. So Christianity teaches, and its claim rests upon the absolute superiority and finality of the Christian conception of God in Christ Jesus, and the Christian experience of divine Saviourhood and redemptive activity of God in human life. The witness in the world to the work of Christ, and the revelation of God's character involved in that work, is to be found in the activity of the Holy Ghost. We thus come in sight of the office and function of the third person of the Trinity in redemption and revelation.

IV. The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit

Now the importance of emphasizing the unity of the Godhead in this connexion cannot be over-emphasized.

We have continually to remind ourselves, when we are dealing with the work of the Spirit, that we are dealing not only with the work of a Person upon persons, but we are dealing with the work of *God*, the Holy Spirit; not a different God, but one and the same God in identity and essence. The work of the Holy Spirit in the world and us is the work of God in the world and in us. Any revelation, therefore, which He may bring to us as persons, any work He may effect in us as persons, will be in all respects God's revelation to us, God's work in us; subject, therefore, to all the conditions which we have already seen must prevail in the relationship between God and those upon whom He has conferred a measure of human freedom. There can be no talk of "irresistible grace," conferred by the Holy Ghost upon us; or of any work in us which is not in a real sense our work. Let us, first of all, consider more closely this thought of the Godhead being in all the operations of the Persons of the Trinity. We shall then be in a better position to appreciate the work of God the Holy Spirit, and what it is He designs to do in us and for us in the fashioning of our personality. Now here we cannot do better than follow closely a well-known writer of the nineteenth century, who, whatever we may think of the defects of his theory of the Atonement, has, none the less, succeeded in bringing out in a very clear way the essential oneness of God through all His relationship with mankind. We are aware of the disastrous results in theology which have followed an attempted separation between the work of the Father and the Son in the Atonement. We are conscious of an attempt to-day to separate the God of the Old Testament from the God of the New. We are in danger of so drawing the sharp line of demarcation between God the Father and God the Holy Spirit as to fail to realize the deep significance of their indissoluble oneness of being in operation to usward.

Now Dr. Bushnell's *Vicarious Sacrifice* helps us here. He makes us realize vividly that in Christ we have God explaining Himself in human terms to the very limit of man's capacity to receive Him. The revelation of God in terms of human life in the Person of Christ was a revelation by God in time and space of eternal truth. Love, *e.g.* as a principle of vicarious sacrifice revealed in the Cross, was true before Christ came to reveal it as a fact of God's life. God had laboured in love before the fact of Calvary in the time process opened men's eyes to the truth. So Dr. Bushnell would have us see in Calvary the revelation of a suffering God. Look at Christ crucified: here we have represented, in His vicarious sacrifice, the feeling of God in all the preceding ages. "It is as if there were a cross unseen, standing on its undiscovered hill, far back in the ages, out of which were sounding, always, just the same deep voice of suffering love and patience that was heard by mortal ears from the sacred hill of Calvary." "What, then, was Christ in His vicarious feeling and sacrifice, what in His Gethsemane, but a revelation in time of just that love that had been struggling always in God's bosom; watching wearily for the world and the inward groanings unheard by mortal ears?" Hence the whole Deity is in the Cross from eternity to eternity. We are not to conceive of our Lord as some other and better side of Deity, a God-composing and satisfying God; but that all there is in Him expresses God, even as He is, and has been of old—such a being in His love that He must needs take our evils on His feeling, and bear the burden of our sin. "Nay," adds Bushnell, "there is a cross in God before the wood is seen on Calvary; hid in God's own virtue itself, struggling on heavily in burdened feeling through all the previous ages, and struggling as heavily now even in the throne of the worlds. This too, exactly, is the cross that our Christ crucified reveals and sets before us."

Now along this line of thought we shall reach also a new conception, not only of the suffering God, but also of the meaning of His continuous work from Calvary onwards through His Holy Spirit. Dr. Bushnell would teach us that, just as God the Father has worked in love from the beginning, and Christ has found an entrance into human conditions in just the same vicarious feeling, so the Holy Spirit works in love as Christ did, suffering all the incidents of love—compassion, wounded feeling, sorrow, concern, burdened sympathy, violated patience—taking men upon Him, to bear them and their sins, precisely as Christ Himself did in His sacrifice, which again was itself a revelation of God's eternal sacrifice.

This conception of the Spirit as God at work within the human heart will save us from the pitfalls of all false divisions in the Being of God such as we harbour, almost unconsciously, in our endeavours to steer a midway course between a barren unitarianism and an undisguised tritheism, when thinking of the Christian conception of God. The word "persons" in the Trinitarian formula, we need hardly be reminded, is not to be taken in the modern connotation of the term when applied to the distinctions within the Trinity. We speak of three "persons," meaning three eternal distinctions within the unity of the Godhead which, for the want of a better term, we call "persons." The result is that we tend to separate the Godhead into three distinct "Gods," functioning in separation, the one from the other, and even unlike in character. We must adjust our thinking afresh to the conception of God as One in Three, as well as Three in One. So doing we shall not readily lose the thought of God when we contemplate Christ, nor miss God the Father when we dwell upon the work of the Holy Spirit. It is the function of the Holy Ghost in the world and in the hearts of men to reveal the Son, as the Son in the days of His flesh revealed the Father. In this way we shall be saved from all misty conceptions of the Holy Spirit as an influence; some invisible missive, or fluid, or magnetic force, traversing unseen the hidden depths of souls, to work God's purpose for them. We shall regain the Christian teaching of a genuinely personal character and life, as pertaining to the Holy Spirit, revealing God as Personal to persons. We raise no question here as to the precise nature of His personality. Suffice it if, in accordance with New Testament usage, we regard Him as a Person, in just the same personal properties of feeling, love, sacrifice, as the Father and the Son, working in a ministry of love, as Dr. Bushnell says, precisely as Jesus did, with a love of the same kind as His, burdened for men, for enemies, heaving in silent agonies of passion to recover and save, fulfilling in every particular the terms of sacrifice as revealed in Christ. It requires quite as much suffering, patience, and affliction to carry on the work of the Spirit as it did to fulfil the ministry and to bear the Cross of Jesus.

Hence (1) the work of the Spirit covers the whole ground of human life, broad as the world is, and continuing through all the untold generations of time. (2) In this world-wide operation He is enduring, not Pilate and the soldiers, a few Jewish priests, but the contradiction of all sinners who ever have lived. He is betrayed by more than one Judas, denied by more than one Peter; struggling on, from age to age, with all the falsities, and treasons, and corruptions, of men. (3) If we remember that the bodily pains of Jesus were the least of His sufferings, and that in the realm of moral sensibility His burdens were heavier, if Gethsemane were a profounder insight into the pain of God than Calvary, then not less but more must be the Spirit's suffering. (4) If we regard the whole of the earthly life of Christ as a revelation in time and space of an eternal reality—God's method of revealing to us who live within the time-process the principles of His life and character as they exist outside the temporal sequence which we can follow, and thus as they abide for ever, in the eternal present; then the Cross, and even the bodily sufferings, attain an awful and profound significance of the Father's Calvary before the Incarnation and of the Spirit's Calvary in the eternal present.

A few hours' bodily suffering are not the measure of God's revelation of what He still endures for us men and for our salvation. "Indeed," says Bushnell, "these bodily pains of Christ on the Cross appear to be a kind of condescension rather to our coarseness, that He might raise an outward flag of distress for our dull sensuous nature to look upon; while, to Him, the principal woe is that which, as incarnate love, He bore all through His ministry, in His griefs, disgusts, wounded sensibilities; that which once or twice He barely speaks of, as when He says 'Now is my soul troubled'; that which made Him, to His friends, 'a man of sorrows'; that which, in the garden, took hold of Him even as an agony, the most appalling scene of tragedy ever beheld in our world. In a quiet, silent hour, when His Person is threatened by no appearance of danger, the wail of His burdened heart breaks out in a way of intensity that is even terrible; while in His trial and mockery, and the bodily torture of His death, His serenity is more remarkable even than His distress. Perceiving thus how the real pain of Jesus, that which constituted the principal cost of His sacrifice, was the burden that lay upon His feeling, baffled and wronged as that feeling ever was, we are let into the precise conception of that equally heavy burden that is borne by the Spirit always." And if this is a deeper pain than the bodily hurt which He can serenely endure on the Cross, what shall we say of the Spirit's suffering, "grieved," "vexed," "lied unto," "resisted," feeling even as Christ felt, having all the sentiment, the love, the wounded sensibility of Christ Himself—Christ's equivalent, in short, abiding in the heart.

(5) He, the Holy Spirit, shares Christ's ministry with Him and upon Him, resting upon Him as a dove in His Baptism; leading Him into and through the great soul-struggle of the temptation; bestowed upon Him "without measure" in His doctrine and ministry; travailing with Him, last of all, in His Gethsemane and His Cross; so that we name Him instigator and upholder of Jesus, who through the Eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God.

(6) After this He acts for and with Christ and continues His work, becoming thus no visible Christ, seen of a few, and heard only so far as a human voice will carry or report proclaim, but an invisible, diffusive, pervasive, everywhere-present, always-abiding Christ—a Christ whom no distance can remove, whom the sick man can have in his chamber, the prisoner in his dungeon, the exile in his place of banishment, the martyr in his fires; present to the heart, more present than looks and words; present where the eye is blind and cannot see Him, and the ear deaf and cannot hear Him speak.

He is thus present to us all in every age, as our living Interpreter, present to consciousness in all the sentiment, love, and sacrifice of the Father and the Son, in such wise present that to each and all of us is revealed through the Holy Spirit the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

(7) Further, His vicarious work is carried on through the same Spirit, Who also helpeth our infirmities: for "we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit Himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered," *i.e.* with strivings of concern or burdened feeling, that are the silent Gethsemane of His ministry.

In this manner do the Scriptures represent to us the Holy Spirit in His vicarious work and office of intercession bathing us inwardly in all Christ's sympathy, bearing our burdens of weakness and sin, and groaning, as it were, His own longings for us into our very prayers.

(8) Such is the picture Dr. Bushnell presents to us of the office and work of the Holy Ghost, and it must be admitted that so presented it goes a long way to remove some of our difficulties when we come to define the relation of the Holy Spirit to the other Persons of the Trinity, and seek to represent to our minds and hearts the present work of the Spirit in the world and in the human heart.

Whilst not identifying Christ and the Spirit or "confounding" the Persons of the Trinity, we can none the less see their work in its identity of content and unity of purpose, whilst we equally clearly discern a difference in method:

> "One operates outwardly, the other inwardly; one before the understanding, the other in it; one making impressions by what is acted before the senses, and addressed to thought; the other by groanings and throbs of divine feeling back of thought."

Christ, laying hold of our feeling by His address to the senses, the Holy Spirit addressing our inmost souls; in any case Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, One God, blessed for ever, working before and through and in us by a ministry of vicarious sacrifice and unceasing love, if so be that at long last He may win our souls to His allegiance.

We have the same God then through all the ages, revealed in divers portions and in divers manners beforetime through

Hebrew prophet, through Greek sage, and through Roman statesman. We think of Him as waiting in a patience at once strong and yearning for the day to come when, as the result of His progressive revelation to men as they were able to bear it, and in a measure to respond to His advances, He could achieve a more intimate union with the human in the Incarnation, and thus bridge the gulf between the human and the Divine, and enter into human life in a more intimate way than ever before in the Person of His Son. This revelation in time and space of Deity, this expression by God of Himself in terms of human life, was necessarily for a season. It was therefore expedient for our sakes that He should go away, that He might thus through death secure such a liberation of His Spirit as would enable Him to return in another form as Spirit, and enter human life through His Incarnation and redemptive work in a way hitherto barred by reason of human sin. As Holy Spirit He returns to the world, which indeed in a sense He had never left, to do in us the work He had done once for all for us in His Atonement. Thus there is an intimate connexion between the work of God the Father before the Incarnation, the work of God the Son in the Incarnation and atoning death, and the work of God the Holy Spirit from the day of Pentecost onwards. That work of the One God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is in its essence and purpose a redemptive and saving work, in accordance with the purpose of God in our creation. He has not ceased to labour with the finished work of Calvary. He is now conveying the benefits of the Lord's Passion to the souls of men. Through the Spirit's activities in the world we get an insight into the activities of the Ascended Lord. We are led thus to expect an advent of the Holy Spirit into our hearts as the necessary sequence to the work of Christ for us. We are the objects still of God's activities. When, then, we find the Church bearing witness to the activities of the Holy Spirit of God through the ages, and more particularly clinging to the rite of Confirmation as a means of conveying the fulness of the unsearchable riches of Christ to the human soul, it is in entire accord with what we believe is God's saving purpose concerning us.

V. Grace and Human Personality

The work of the Holy Spirit is seen to be God's work in us, (*a*) in regeneration, (*b*) in sanctification. It is at once the New Birth, the recreation of the true self; the fashioning anew of the human after the divine intention; it is, further, the gradual building up of the new man in Christ Jesus; the application of a redeeming Life to the spirit of man. The whole doctrine of Divine Grace is implied and involved when we speak of the work of the Holy Spirit in us. It is God at work in human life, conferring upon men the benefits of the Lord's Passion. This conception of grace as the action of a Person upon us, as persons, will save us from all crude materialism when we come to consider the way in which we are to conceive of the method of operation by which the Spirit comes into contact with us. It is, from first to last, a relationship that is set up between the living God and the soul of man.

A recent work by a learned scholar with considerable philosophical acumen has brought out this thought in a clear and convincing manner. We cannot follow Dr. Oman all the way in his treatment of "Grace and Personality," as will appear in the course of this survey; but we can take warning from his teaching as to the disastrous effects to faith and life which flow from a disregard of the fundamental character of grace as a relationship between persons. Had this been borne in mind, we should not have had the interminable debates concerning "irresistible grace." We should have been saved from some of the worst exaggerations of Calvinism had we remembered that God does not overrule the human spirit in any arbitrary manner; that moral suasion is never omnipotent compulsion. As Dr. Oman aptly puts it, "The long, sorrowful experience of the ages seems to show that the last thing God thinks of doing is to drive mankind, with resistless rein, on the highway of righteousness"; and again, "May it be," he asks, "that we shall find less of God in life, and not find His operation less adequate to our spiritual needs, because we discover His method to be patient enough to pass round by way of persuasion and education through our errors and failures?" Such a query reveals in a flash to our spiritual gaze the long-suffering of God and the patience of the Holy Spirit now in waiting an entrance to our hearts, rather than forcing Himself upon us without our desire for His presence.

Now the doctrine of God's grace, as the activity of a Divine Person in the world, and in the human heart, aims a fatal blow at Pelagianism in all its forms, and bids God's children not to rely upon their unaided efforts in the search for strength to resist temptation and security amidst the trials of life. We have to remember, moreover, that the gift of Himself to aid us is not dependent upon a prior activity on our part in moral effort and achievement. God is revealed in Baptism as the Prime Mover in our redemption, taking the initiative at every turn; His love brooding over us before we are even able consciously to respond, as in the case of Infant Baptism. So, all through, the Catholic teaching is that of prevenient as well as co-operating grace. For, as Dr. Oman says: "Morality as a doing to win God's backing, is not moral; for it is certain to issue in a corrupt personal motive of selfish good, complicated by a corrupt personal hesitation due to considering another interest than duty. Our attention is directed from our task to our merit with God." Now, if grace is conceived of as a relation between God and ourselves, as moral and spiritual persons, its efficacy will depend upon our whole-hearted acceptance of the promptings to good; the aspirations to holiness; the uplift to an ideal beyond us; in short, the whole activity of the Spirit within, so far as He is able to work. We must respond, as deep responds to deep. Hence the acceptance of grace is dependent all through upon a living faith on our part, without which grace would fail of its purpose, and in fact be an impossibility. There can be no impersonal operations of God within our souls; no passivity on our part such as would secure our regeneration and sanctification by God in spite of ourselves and our wishes.

(*a*) *Infant Baptism*

If, then, we conceive of Baptism as a miracle of Divine Grace in the case of an infant, God's approach to its soul and His work upon its soul must obviously be in the nature of a potentiality rather than an actuality; in this sense, that only to the extent to which the growing spiritual consciousness of the child responds to His advance, can the work of regeneration pass from stage to stage in its movement towards complete sanctification. We must conceive of justification and sanctification, not as two isolated and completed acts, but rather as two aspects of a living relationship between the soul and God. The new birth is, after all, in Baptism but a birth. Hence we do no violence to the principle of grace as a relationship in Dr. Oman's sense when we allow God to take the initiative, and do for our souls something which in a real sense is His act, apart from our consent and conscious co-operation in the first instance. The analogy of earthly birth may help us here perhaps to avoid the conclusion some have drawn against Infant Baptism as inconsistent with God's known method of dealing with us as with sons, *i.e.* moral and spiritual persons. Now we were not consulted by our parents as to whether we should be born, or under what circumstances, in what environment, under what conditions. As a result, we do not turn round and accuse them of a violation of our right as moral persons to be consulted in all that pertains to our personality. So in the spiritual birth, surely, the fact that we are born again of water and the Holy Ghost by a divine operation before we could be in any sense consciously able to co-operate with God in the act does not necessarily convict Him of a violation of our human freedom, nor render His act in our case open to the charge of being immoral. As in the case of earthly birth, once born, both parent and child can co-operate together in love for the achievement of human personality, so in the case of the spiritual birth. It is God's act. In the case of infants it is His act, without any conscious co-operation on our part at first. Moreover, we cannot escape from being children in God's hands during certain stages of our spiritual progress. We are, most of us, even now far indeed from being full grown. To this extent we fail in full co-operation with God in the working out of His eternal purpose. Hence the operation of His grace must still to some extent be in the nature of an overruling Providence for our good. Just as a father must, if needs be, save a child from danger in spite of its struggles, and the act is seen by the child later to have been justified in the light of the father's superior knowledge as the child comes in time to realize it. To this extent we must admit, I think, the presence of impersonal operations of God's grace even in the sphere where they are seemingly most out of place and illegitimate, viz. in the relationship of a moral and spiritual God with moral and spiritual sons. God deals with us as with children, not at first or for some time as full-grown men. Trust is of the essence of the relationship.

(*b*) *Faith*

Now the Church has ever taught the need of faith in the recipient as essential for the *full efficacy* of sacramental grace. Hence, when a period of time separates Baptism from Confirmation, the peculiar fitness of the latter as the completion of Infant Baptism will be the more appreciated in this connexion. The faith which was vicariously presented on the child's behalf by its spiritual representatives in the persons of its godparents is now demanded from the child himself when he has reached years of discretion. Hence the custom of attaching to the Confirmation Service proper, in the Anglican Rite, an introductory part in the public confession of allegiance to Christ as Master, the confirming of the vows made at Baptism in the child's name, by the child himself in his own person, is the more appropriate as evidence of a conscious faith and witness to the Living Christ before the gift of the Holy Ghost is vouchsafed in response to the prayers of the Church. The candidates, if well instructed, are aware that the efficacy of the gift is dependent upon the attitude of mind and heart of the child, and that unless the door be open for the advent of the living God to the soul, God Himself will not force an entrance.

Teaching which ignores this vital point inevitably suggests that the grace conferred is of a semi-magical character, capable of effectual working apart from any activity of the soul in faith toward God. An examination of the Anglican Service books will show that the full efficacy of sacramental grace is in all cases of its bestowal expressly conditioned by the presence of faith in the recipient. If Christ Himself found this a vital necessity for the efficacy of His healing work, the Church has but followed His lead when it has been faithful in its insistence upon this factor in the relationship of the soul to God in and through the means of grace. Dr. Oman puts the case very strongly when he tells us that "Prayer, word, and sacrament are still the means of grace, yet only as they are moral means adapted to moral ends, and not merely as they are devices or vehicles or impressive doings. Except as moral means they cannot help to manifest God's gracious personal relation to His children; for devices for wringing blessings out of God or vehicles for conveying something into man, however individual they may be, are not, in any moral sense, personal." We should need to qualify this to a certain extent, as we have suggested, but, when all is said and done, the justice of the truth in it must and in fact is recognized by the Church, in its insistence on the importance of faith in sacramental grace. It will not be denied that teachers from time to time in the Church's history have forgotten or ignored its lesson, with disastrous results. Hence the revolt against the whole sacramental system on the part of some who, by their revolt, let us not forget, have witnessed to forgotten truth and helped the Church to regain its bearings.

We should maintain (1) that sacramental grace through sacramental channels always conveys a blessing to those who are its recipients, provided that they are in a state of grace. (2) That the efficacy of the sacraments is not the creation of the recipient's faith, and purely a subjective effect. Its validity rests upon the fact of its being an act of God in the soul, and not upon our subjective feeling or in any sense as being due to self-suggestion, or hetero-suggestion. (3) That sacraments, therefore, always produce some effect in the recipients. We have scriptural authority for the effects of unworthy participation of the Eucharist, and the Church regards such an act as sacrilege.

(4) Our faith does not create the blessing, but enables us to perceive and consciously to receive the gift.

We may, as infants, be unconscious recipients of God's Holy Spirit in Baptism ; we may, as persons having reached years of discretion, become conscious recipients of the gift of the same Holy Spirit in increased measure. (5) The very fact that the child does come to the Confirmation Service, however ill-prepared, is in itself a sign that it has some faint desire for God, and we may well believe that the yearning of omnipotent Love for the soul will not let any opening, however small, be missed to win a way into the child's heart which God so greatly loves.

These considerations lead us naturally to the question of the place and function of the sacramental principle in the Church's teaching, and more particularly in relation to the doctrine of God's activity in human life in the Person of God, the Holy Spirit.

We may fittingly close this section of our subject and open the next by quoting once again an apt sentence from Dr. Oman's stimulating work :

> " To deliver the soul from the sin which is its ruin, and bestow on it the holiness which is its health and peace, is the end of all God's dealings with His children ; and precisely because He cannot merely give, but must enable us to attain it ourselves if we are really to have the liberty of His children, the way He must take is long and arduous."

VI. (*a*) Grace and Faith

Now this insistence upon God's revelation and God's grace being dependent in a measure upon an activity of soul on our part, and the caution that our living faith is the essential condition of His activity finding expression in our lives and of our being able thus to make it our own—whilst it is necessary as a safeguard against any magical conception of supernatural grace and secures the thought of revelation and inspiration as two aspects of one process, viewed either from the Divine or the human standpoint, and as thus in its essence a living relationship, moral and spiritual, between persons, God and man—this insistence does not commit us to the view that only those who by nature and temperament are capable of a peculiar "religious thrill" will be able to share in the benefits of the Lord's Passion. This would be to set up another barrier between the soul and God, and to make His gifts dependent upon our feeling. We avoid this error if we remember that faith is not to be expressed necessarily, still less exclusively, in terms of feeling. It is an activity of the whole personality, including will and intellect as well as feeling. Its expression will vary according to temperament, *i.e.* the predominance of feeling over will and intellect—of the intellectual activity over feeling and will—of the will to believe over feeling and intellect—all this obviously must depend upon the constitutional temper of each individual. All we have to remember is that, whether one element or the other finds predominant expression in the activity, none the less all three elements of a living whole are present in the act of faith. It has too often been forgotten, in this connexion, that "conversion" is not exclusively or normally "sudden." The question of temperament plays a large part in the "form" the conversion takes, whether it be a slow, gradual progress or a cataclysmic irruption. Moreover, "conversion" and "regeneration," whilst intimately associated at times, are not identical. The one is an attitude or an activity of man towards God; the other is a work of God upon the soul. The one is from below Godwards; the other is from above manwards. Again, God's grace is conveyed to the soul in accordance with its nature and its needs. We may well believe that an almighty, holy love will deal with no two children of God in exactly the same way. The wise Physician, with an infinite patience, deals with individuals, not with "cases," and, moreover, with a care for each which is truly wonderful, as religious experience abundantly testifies:

> That Thou shouldst love a wretch like me,
>   And be the God Thou art;
> 'Tis madness to my intellect,
>   But music to my heart.

The emotional element has its place in religion, but not to the exclusion of other relatively more important elements in our complex personality. In any case, all through we are dealing with the Personality of God, the Holy Spirit, and not with a body of impersonal theology or a universalized religious experience frozen into a dogma and exalted to a norm for every life, and as such imposed as a condition of salvation. We must not argue that an experience which proved to be a saving experience for a particular individual must therefore be repeated in each one of us as the sole condition for a like salvation. No two experiences are identical. The appeal of Jesus finds men at different levels—in the ecstatic rapture of the mystic; the intellectual vision of the philosopher and seeker after truth; in the quietism of the Quaker; the evangelical fervour of the revivalist; the quiet and sedate devotion of the churchman, who finds reality through sacramental channels. All we insist upon as essential for the appropriation of God's grace, be it mediated to us sacramentally or otherwise, is an activity, fully conscious or subliminal, on the part of the recipient. We define faith as the inner activity of the soul by which we apprehend, however vaguely and dimly at first, the all-pervading and realizable Presence of the unseen God. Such apprehension by the senses of the soul may be, in our infancy in spiritual growth, in the nature rather of a potential capacity than a self-conscious activity; its presence as such is the condition of God's approach and God's work in us. If He intervene in our lives at first as babes and work a miracle of regeneration, planting the seed of eternal life in our hearts, such action, as we have already pointed out, is not inconsistent with His self-imposed respect for our freedom in His treatment of us as the Physician of our souls.

(*b*) *The Sacraments in the Church System*

If in this line of thought we seem to be undermining the Church's insistence upon the confirmation of her members and suggesting that the latter is really unnecessary, since its effects may be gained apart from the rite and God may dispense with His Church channels in the distribution of His grace, our answer is that the question really must be dealt with in connexion with the whole problem of the Church's authority, its divine sanctions, and its consequent binding character upon Christians. The Church has ever held that Baptism admits us into a new covenant relationship with God in Christ Jesus. The new life thus begun is to be built up by communion with God in Christ, not in isolation from our brethren but in a fellowship of the faith. The life is nourished, sustained, strengthened in corporate worship. We isolate ourselves from this fellowship at our own peril and to our own loss. Whilst man can set no limit to the avenues of approach through which God will seek to enter into his life and to build it up in Christ Jesus ; none the less if he finds that God has ordained certain channels, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, these must be vital and " generally necessary for salvation." He will cherish and use them as such. He will neglect them at his peril. Their necessity is a matter not of private judgment, not of individual preference, but of divine revelation and command. A failure on the part of human understanding to fathom the mystery of their divine operation is the least of all excuses for their deliberate neglect. Baptism is, and must ever remain, the ordained channel of entrance to the covenanted mercies of God in Christ Jesus. The Altar is, and must ever remain, the centre of the Church's worship. The Lord's Supper is, and must ever remain, the ordained channel for the communication of God's life to His people. There He stands in their midst ; there He makes Himself known to them in the breaking of the bread ; there He offers Himself—the Bread of Life—for their cleansing and refreshment. This service is the most truly evangelical of all the Church's services. There we commemorate the Lord's Passion. It is a memorial. It is equally clearly and vitally also a reception, and a communion. It is not the revival of a memory of an absent dead Master. It is the receiving into our souls of a life-giving Lord. It is a feeding on Him, an assimilation of that which is to preserve body and soul unto everlasting life. We have not exhausted the significance of this central service of the Christian Church when we have indicated this much as to its meaning. We have said enough, however, to indicate its vital importance as an ordained channel of communion between God and His people gathered together in His Name. In Baptism, He receives us at the Font and imparts to our souls the seed of eternal life. In Confirmation we are strengthened by the renewal of that life. In the Holy Communion He bids us come and receive regularly of His grace. We do well, therefore, to emphasize the centrality of the two great Sacraments in this connexion, and the place of Confirmation in relation to them, standing as it does linked to both as the completion of the one and the entrance to the other. God is not bound by sacraments. Let us never forget this. Let us at the same time remember that, if He is not bound, we are. There is a moral obligation resting upon every Christian as the result of His definite commands. "If ye love Me, keep My commandments." Baptism and the Eucharist are included in this Divine exhortation. We can set no limit to His avenues of approach. We can act upon His definite instructions as to where to find Him for certain without fail.

We shall best, however, commend the sacraments of the Church if we endeavour to show their relationship to the whole sacramental principle of which they are but an example of the Church order. We proceed, then, to the consideration of this principle in nature and in the life of man.

VII. The Sacramental Principle

Whilst the two great sacraments are the duly ordained, and therefore normal, channels for the conveyance to the Christian of the life-giving Spirit of the Risen Lord, they are part of a larger medium for the union and communion of the soul with its Maker ; they are the centre of a system of "means of grace" within the Church. And these means of grace within the Church are in their turn part of a larger medium through which the all-pervading Presence makes itself known and energizes within the sphere of the world and human life.

(*a*) *In Nature*

All nature is a sacrament of God's Presence. He lives and breathes in the material universe. He is found speaking to us in the beauty of a landscape or in the magnificent grandeur of the mountain scenery. He has a message for us in the flowers, if only our eyes were open to see His glory in and through them. William Blake, poet and artist, was once asked what he could see in the sun; whether, when it rose, it was not simply in appearance a round disc of fire somewhat like a sovereign. "Oh no, no!" he cried, "I see an innumerable company of the heavenly host, crying, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God Almighty." And who shall say that in and through that mystic vision, the poet's soul was not nourished and something of God's life-giving grace conveyed to it?

All the world is full of voices, and in a thousand ways God is speaking to us, if only we have the attentive ear, the heart receptive. Through Nature He speaks; through the material He functions; through varied channels He keeps open His living contact with the souls of men, and conveys to them His Life.

> If any flower shall breathe for thee
> A fragrant message from its pencilled urn;
> If spring airs glad thee; if the sunset bring
> Into thine eyes the tears of solemn joy;
> If any radiant passion come to make
> Existence beautiful and pure to thee;
> If something deepest in thee wakes
> To a dim sentiment of mystery—
> Ponder such ministrations, and be sure
> Thou hast been touched by God,
> O human heart!

Thus does the all-pervading Presence of the Almighty Spirit of God live and breathe through all creation and make Himself known to men. This is the sacramental principle in its broadest and widest sense. This also is the principle of the Incarnation; the divine, because of its kinship with the human, able to express itself in terms of human life; able to take a Body, and, dwelling in it, to redeem it from corruption and to lift it up to the level of the spiritual, using it as a means in and through which it may function in time and space.

(*b*) *In the Church System*

If we are ever to convince people of the normal character of the sacraments of the Church as ordained channels of divine grace, we must lay the foundation for them in the Incarnation itself, and exhibit them as an extension, within the Church, of the Incarnation. And more than this, we must show that they are but the highest revelation of a great sacramental principle which runs through all creation and is the method whereby the Spirit of God reveals Himself through the material to the spirit of man.

Two books may be mentioned in this connexion: the one by Dr. Morgan Dix, *The Sacramental System*; the other by Paul B. Bull, *The Sacramental Principle*. Both writers have set forth in a convincing manner the way in which the system of grace, through sacramental channels, may be thought of as based upon the nature of God, the constitution of man, and God's relationship to His creation. Nature, to some, may appear in the guise of a godless phenomenon, the outcome of a blind movement directed by no intelligent ruler; to others it is the creation of God, and thus all creation is the veil of His Presence, all His works a mirror into which we may gaze and see His face. So St. Paul would teach us that "the invisible things of God may be understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead," *i.e.* creation reveals the Creator and is a sacrament of His Presence. "Whenever visible things reach out into the eternal and carry us with them to God, there is a sacrament," the basis of such a belief being in the Apostle's words the fact that "of Him and through Him and unto Him are all things." Thus the whole universe is full of sacraments; "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork." So man, made after His image, in virtue of his constitution as material and spiritual, in touch with the material through his senses, and with the spiritual through spiritual faculties, is able to find the living God.

(*c*) *In Human Life*

Thus, in the sacramental system, Dr. Morgan Dix would teach us that throughout God's universe is effected an alliance between man and God. Why, then, should not the same Hand which beckons to us through the veil of nature be laid upon us as we kneel in adoration before His Altar? Why should He not use material means for bringing about spiritual effects? He is Lord over the material, and in the days of His flesh He made it subserve His spiritual purposes. Nature offers medicine to heal our bodies, vegetable and mineral helps, tonics, anodynes. Why, then, should not the Holy Ghost, through natural elements exalted to a supernatural efficacy, minister to the diseases of the soul? The element of water, of which the human body is to some extent composed, why should it not be sanctified to the mystical washing away of sin? The corn, the staple food of man; the grape, the wine, the common drink amongst Eastern people: why should not these be instrumental means of sanctification, holy gifts to purify, feed, and hallow human life? If God is present in nature, why not in one of nature's products? So argues Dr. Morgan Dix; and it is surely a reasonable contention. He which hath said of the one sacrament (Baptism), "Wash and be clean," hath said concerning the other likewise, "Eat and live." We need more than ever to-day to grasp the fact that Christ Himself is the crowning illustration of the sacramental principle; that He was made man in order that man might know God, and that God in Christ is the Sacrament of sacraments. We need to realize afresh to-day that, as Paul Bull puts it, "from the cold, passionless message of the stars to the burning brain of man, the Spirit of God is using matter as the medium through which He communicates Himself to man." Thus by this sacramental interpretation of the universe we are enabled "to realize the interpenetration of what seems to be material by what seems to be spiritual. This interpenetration preserves for us the real mystery, the spirituality of the universe, the mentality of the body. And this living mystery is preserved in all its rich vitality in the sacramental system of the Church, in which we at all times see the material used as the vehicle and the instrument of the Spirit—in Holy Baptism the water interpenetrated by the Spirit, in Holy Communion the bread and wine caught up into living union with the risen and ascended humanity of Christ, and becoming His most holy Body and His most precious Blood—in fact, see the whole universe, not as a dead machine, but, in St. Athanasius' phrase, as "the Body of God."

(*d*) *The Real Presence*

This broader conception enables us to see that, whilst the two sacraments are God's ordained channels in a special sense and for a special purpose, yet they are not the only means of grace. It will enable us to understand how it is that many who neglect, and in some cases definitely repudiate the sacraments, are yet in vital and spiritual relationship with God outside the covenanted mercies of His Church. If it be urged that the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist is only another manifestation of His Presence which can be known and experienced at other times, in other ways, through other means; if men assure us, as they do, that they find Him in the fields and lanes; in the privacy of their own prayer-life, in times of meditation and feeding upon His written Word, the Bible; in public worship, at morning and evening prayer, and so on, we gladly accept their assurance, and know the truth of it in our own religious experience.

(*e*) *The Conception of Purpose*

But there is a difference, if not in kind yet in degree, between the Real Presence at the Altar and in other ways. Dr. Walpole has suggested in what precisely this difference consists. It is that the Presence admits of modes and degrees. He suggests that the Reality of the Presence may be dominated by *purpose*. Hence it is the purpose of the Eucharist that determines the power of the Presence. "Our association with our High Priest in His dread offering of His Blood is the highest privilege we can enjoy. . . . We have, wonderful to relate, boldness to enter into the holy place here, and be as near our Lord in this great rite, as though we were with Him in the Upper Room on the night that He suffered. This is, then, the peculiar glory of the Eucharist, and we can easily see why it deserves the unique position that it holds in the Church." So in the Eucharist He is not more really present than in any other service, nor less really present at any one point than at any other in His own service. But at the moment of Consecration there is a manifestation of His Presence in a special way and for a special purpose. "The great High Priest," says Dr. Walpole, "has been present from the beginning, as the Head of the Body, and is not more really present after the consecration than before. And yet there takes place now a new manifestation of His Presence. He desires that the whole body of the worshippers shall be one with Him, not only in will and intention, but in substantial unity. He seeks to incorporate them into Himself, so that they may be actually one with Him in His great presentation. . . . This communication of Himself to us is, of course, to each one who is spiritually fitted to receive Him a new manifestation of His Presence. We are nearer then to the moment when the veil will be lifted, and we see Him face to face, than at any other time, for He is imparting to us Himself. And the fact that He is communicating others besides ourselves gives a new expression to His Divine Presence. We rightly kneel to receive His Body and Blood into ourselves, because He is turning to us now and communicating His whole life into our starved lives. And it is natural that the elements, being what they are, should, as it were, focus that Divine Presence which fills the Church. They make the point at which we touch Christ and receive Him into our being. They are to us the meeting-place where He comes to us and we come to Him. We, to use the words of the Catechism, take as well as receive the Body and Blood of Christ. It is true that we are one with Him before we receive, being members of His Body; but we now receive a fresh draught of His Life into ourselves."

Now such a line of thought as is suggested in these words of Dr. Walpole enables us to see how unique is the place of the Lord's own Service in any consideration of the various means of grace through which the soul is brought into contact with God and God is given to the soul. The fact that it is still a living reality in the Catholic Church, and that, humanly speaking, it will continue to be celebrated "till He come," suggests that Christian experience has decided conclusively in its favour. Those who in every age have been obedient to His command have received His blessing and have been vouchsafed His Presence in so real and unmistakable a manner that they have guarded this means of grace at all costs, and handed it down from generation to generation as the most sacred privilege in the Christian Church.

And, if this be true of the central sacrament of the Church's system, it is equally true of that rite which in the Anglican Church is the entrance to the Eucharist. Confirmation also may owe its peculiar blessing to the fact of *purpose* in the Spirit's Presence. He wills to impart Himself in a special manner at that service to the life which is offered to Him in loyal allegiance, and which attends in the atmosphere of united prayer invoking His special blessing and the armour so needed before entering upon the struggle of life. Did we but view the rite of Confirmation as we have endeavoured to present it in its true setting within the whole circle of Christian truth, we should not, perhaps, find it opposed even by members of the Church in the way, alas, in which it is opposed amongst professing Christians. If the Anglican Church has in its wisdom thought fit to order that this rite shall be the entrance to the greatest sacrament of grace which can be offered to the seeker after God, it is surely the duty of loyal members of the Church to come forward and receive this blessing by the laying on of hands, not only for the grace conferred through it, as the "Sacrament of Warriors," but also for the further privilege to which it introduces us as full members of the Body and duly qualified to receive the full privileges the Church can offer.

VIII. (*a*) Spirit and Matter

In the light of this sacramental principle we are able to dispose of the oft-repeated charge brought against the

Church Sacraments in general, and against Confirmation in particular, that they introduce a non-moral element in the conception of grace as in its essence a moral relationship between persons, and insert a quasi-magical and materialistic idea, as though grace were a kind of ethereal fluid conveyed to the soul by the laying on of hands. A typical sixteenth-century pronouncement is found in the Parker Society publications, vol. iii, p. 234, the words of one, Becon by name, who thus delivers himself :

> " What is the Confirmation of the children that is used at this present [Queen Mary's reign] but plain devilry, witchcraft, juggling, legerdemain, and all that nought is ? The Bishop mumbleth a few Latin words over the child, charmeth him, crosseth him, smeareth him with stinking popish oil."

And Calfhill, in the same strain, says :

> " What promise have they of grace annexed in this Sacrament, unless they have shut up the Holy Ghost in their greese pot ? "

In modern times the same objection is urged, though in more refined language, by the descendants of those who, in their zeal to purge the Church from all errors, abuses, corruptions, and sins, swept away not only the abuses but the apostolic rites themselves. The writer of the article " Holy Spirit of God," in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, points out that in both Old and New Testaments the Spirit is said to clothe, come mightily upon, fall upon, carry away, push or move, men, and in the Old Testament *rûaḥ* is certainly used as suggestive of a kind of fluid element " poured out " like a stupefying drug or used for anointing —something that can be put into a person or by which he can be filled. Consequently, the writer suggests that such expressions have influenced New Testament terminology, and certainly later Greek theological speculation in the concept of the Spirit or grace as a kind of " substance " imparted to believers in the Sacrament : the " medicine of immortality." He goes on to draw attention to the modern outlook, with its grasp upon the *immateriality* of spirit and its consequent revolt against the crude materialism of an ethereal fluid, as derogatory to the spiritual content of the idea of grace in the divine economy, and in fact as a return to animism in thought.

Now our treatment of the doctrine of God, the Holy Spirit, has emphasized the concept of personality—God as a dynamic activity, transcendent above, and therefore immanent in the cosmos and in human life. We have further suggested that the sacramental principle is the recognition of this fact of the divine omniscience and omnipresence. Moreover, His activity in and through the material is not to be conceived of as involving in any sense a pantheistic idea, such as would be suggested if we were thinking in terms of philosophical immanentism. On the contrary, the postulates of transcendence and immanence as correlatives in our Christian philosophy enable us to escape the snare of pantheism, and with it also the charge of introducing semi-magical conceptions into our sacramental system. It is obvious that, according to the sacramental principle, spirit can hold relations with spirit in and through and by means of material things which are used by spiritual selves as media. This does not mean that the spirit, by its use of matter, is thereby confused with it or in some sense made identical with it. The fact that the material is the medium of communication does not destroy the character of the relationship in the very least; nay, it is fully in accord with the way we act in our normal human life when we use our bodies as the instruments in and through and by means of which we function in the world and carry on intercourse one with another. If the pressure of a hand in mine can speak more eloquently than words of my friend's sympathy with me in my trouble, and that same touch can further brace my soul to bear its burden in the knowledge and felt experience of my friend's strength conveyed to me in the act; are we to say that God the Holy Ghost is debarred from conveying Himself and His strength to my soul by the laying on of hands? Is it not natural to expect that the Spirit of God will approach our spirits through nature, through material channels; that He will make His Presence more really felt at particular times, through particular means, for a particular purpose? Is it impossible to conceive of the reality of His presence being governed in its approach by *purpose*; that He designs to be made known particularly in the "breaking of the bread"; that He condescends in His love to enter the human soul through ordained channels for particular purposes in His divine wisdom? The sacramental principle in the Church system is exactly what we ought to look for, especially when we have Divine warrant and explicit command to use water, bread, and wine in the two sacraments of His ordaining.

(*b*) *The Laying on of Hands*

Further, if the laying on of hands was in Old Testament times a recognized sign and method of blessing; if it has been employed by Jesus Himself in the days of His flesh when He laid His hands upon the children and blessed them—is it altogether inconceivable that in the case of young people just entering into the larger world of temptation, and upon the more serious tasks of life, God should desire to bestow a special blessing? They need the whole armour of God in the fight against sin, the world, and the devil. They come and bear public witness of their allegiance to Jesus as their Master in the church in the presence of His people and their Father in God, the bishop of the diocese. Is it inconceivable that on such an occasion, when, after invoking the prayers of the faithful and following the example of the Apostles, the bishop, according to custom immemorial, invokes God's blessing upon the candidates thus gathered together after weeks of preparation and instruction with prayer—that God's Holy Spirit should through the laying on of hands of a chosen servant, the bishop, enter more fully into the expectant soul of the young boy or girl? Surely it is natural to expect that the all-pervading Presence should make itself felt more really at that moment in the life of the child; should find a dwelling-place as a permanent Guest by express invitation; should be willing, in fact, to come in and abide with the child "all the days," and make Himself known after that in even fuller measure in the "breaking of the bread" according to His promise! The whole conception is beautiful to a degree, and, far from being incredible or inconceivable, is, in fact, naturally to be expected and rightly to be looked for. The marvel rather is that so many should doubt its possibility, question its desirability, and seek to pour contempt upon it, from a mistaken failure to grasp the true inwardness and spiritual character of the rite in intention and act throughout. True that the ceremony may lend itself to possible superstition, and this must be guarded against; but, when all is said and done on this head, the fact still remains that the rite can be justified as fully in accord with the whole doctrine of the Church and Sacraments in their vital connexion with the life and work of Christ in His Incarnation, Atonement, and revelation of God's saving activity, followed as this was by the activity of the Ascended Lord and the descent of the Holy Ghost to achieve in us what Christ died to do for us.

The only real objection, apart from prejudice, to such a rite as Confirmation comes from those who still cling to a Manichæan conception of the inherent evil of matter as such, and have consequently failed to grasp the real significance of the Incarnation, with its lesson that, what God hath cleansed, we must not presume to call common or unclean. The Incarnation is our safeguard against a false spirituality which has wrought untold harm especially in English Christianity since the Reformation. We are taught by the Incarnation not to despise matter, but rather to see in it something, in itself non-moral, but which can be used by spirit for good or evil purposes; something therefore which is used by the Holy Spirit for beneficent ends. In it and through it every day He conveys Himself to our souls—in the water of Baptism performing a miracle of divine grace in regeneration, in the laying on of hands in Confirmation bestowing upon His children the Sevenfold gifts of His Spirit, in bread and wine in Communion conveying His very Life for our cleansing and sustenance.

The proof of it lies not in any intellectual demonstration or elaborate argument to refute objections. Its evidence lies deeper and closer at hand. It is in a living experience which can be tested. The Church witnesses through its long history, as we have seen, to its truth and worth. We can to-day bear our testimony also and invite people not to accept a truth which has witness borne to it in the spiritual experience of the past, but also to a truth which people now can test for themselves, if they will. The Church invites men to share an experience. "That which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you; that ye also may have fellowship with us." "Not that we would lord it over your faith, but that we may be helpers of your joy."

IX. (*a*) Practical Significance of Confirmation

We gain a very vivid conception of God's purpose for human life when we consider the end He has in view for each one of us, if we are willing to allow Him to enter into our lives. It is worth while, in this connexion, to recall a chapter in Professor Drummond's work, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, in which he points us to biology for an analogy. What is it that makes one little speck of protoplasm grow into Newton's dog and another speck into Newton himself? It is a mysterious something which has entered into the protoplasm, seemingly with a purpose and end in view. Professor Drummond quotes Huxley's description, from observation, of the development, out of a speck of protoplasm, of one of the commonest animals:

"'Strange possibilities lie dormant in that semi-fluid globule. Let a moderate supply of warmth reach its watery cradle and the plastic matter undergoes changes so rapid, and yet so steady and purpose-like in their succession, that one can only compare them to those operated by a skilled modeller upon a formless lump of clay. As with an invisible trowel the mass is divided and subdivided into smaller and smaller portions, until it is reduced to an aggregation of granules not too large to build withal the finest fabrics of the nascent organism. And then, it is as if a delicate finger traced out the line to be occupied by the spinal column, and moulded the contour of the body;

pinching up the head at one end, the tail at the other, and fashioning flank and limb into due proportions in so artistic a way that, watching the process hour by hour, one is almost involuntarily possessed by the notion that some more subtle aid to vision than the achromatic would show the hidden artist, with his plan before him, striving with skilful manipulation to perfect his work.' "

The artist, so Drummond suggests, is the life-principle, working according to law—the law of conformity to type. There are a great many different kinds of life. Hence we find bird-life seizing upon the bird-germ and building up a bird, the image of itself ; according to the law that every living thing must stamp upon its offspring the image of itself. Now, just as bird life builds up its kind, reptile life its kind, and man his kind, so we are led to think of a higher principle still—the Christ-life, seeking to build up His kind, after His image. The design of God in Christ—the saving activity of the Holy Spirit in human life—works for this end, viz. the production of Christians. Hence the significance of the scriptural language: "the new creature"; "begotten of God"; "God's workmanship." Hence the thought, "Whom He did foreknow He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son." The design of God for human life is thus seen to be this : *that Christ be formed in us.*

The analogy can be still closer pressed, as Drummond shows in his chapter on "Conformity to Type." Just as on the lower levels we find the life-principle working upon already existing matter, so the Holy Spirit takes our human nature as "spiritual protoplasm" and builds up from it the "new man" in Christ Jesus. As in the natural world the lower subserves the higher—the mineral world supplying material for the vegetable, the vegetable for the animal, and all three kingdoms ministering to the needs of man—so we may think of our lives as supplying material for the Spirit's fashioning. God can find in mind and character, will and affections, moral traits and spiritual affinities, the basis of a spiritual self for each one of us. Given the capacity on the part of the human for a higher becoming and the willingness to be conformed, the Spirit is enabled to fashion us anew after the pattern of Christ's example. It is the old concept of the Potter and the clay, and it is wonderfully suggestive. God's purpose in His love is indicated in Christ's own words: "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." Such is God's design, and the work is *His*.

As the protoplasm cannot conform itself nor the embryo fashion itself, so it must be with ourselves as "spiritual protoplasm" in His hands. It is Christ Who makes the Christian. We are "to be conformed"; "to be converted"; "to be born anew." We cannot convert ourselves. Hence the essential need for the advent of the Holy Spirit upon us. Without Him we can do nothing. We are simply capable of natural growth from a natural birth; the supernatural birth and our spiritual growth into the man that is to be are His work. We can co-operate by the way of obedience: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost"; "Take and eat this." Our willingness is shown in Mary's words: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word." Obedience to His commands; willing surrender to His love; the losing of the life to find it again at a higher level as the result of His work in us,—these are of the very essence of all true growth in the spiritual life. The process of regeneration and sanctification, our spiritual growth and development, we may leave to Him, being sure of this one thing, viz. that He Who hath begun a good work in us will perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ. Such a spiritual birth and growth constitutes the possession of eternal life for us here and now. We are members of Christ; the children of God; present possessors of the Kingdom of Heaven. We can picture, moreover, a progressive development from life through death to fuller and more glorious life. Whilst it doth not yet appear what we shall be, none the less, inasmuch as He is engaged in building us up from existing material, we have the assurance that the result will not be some strange new creature, unrecognizable and having no point of contact with our former selves. Our destiny is not to become quasi-divine beings but spiritual selves with our own distinctive characteristics, our own individualities, our own traits and features. We shall be our true selves.

(*b*) *Its Bearing and Importance in the Christian Life*

Hence the appeal of the God of love to the human soul. As the yearning life, He longs to seize hold of us and to fashion us into something glorious. In His love He discerns the hidden possibilities in each one of us, and asks to be allowed to bring to actuality the potential capacities of our human nature made in the image of the divine. He sees something in us the world missed; the man I long to be.

> But all the world's coarse thumb
>   And finger failed to plumb,
> So passed in making up the main account;
>   All instincts immature,
>   All purposes unsure,
> That weighed not as his work, yet swelled the man's amount:
>
> Thoughts hardly to be packed
>   Into a narrow act,
> Fancies that broke through language and escaped;
>   All I could never be,
>   All men ignored in me,
> This I was worth to God, whose wheel the pitcher shaped.

The Holy Spirit desires to take the young life, with all its potential capacity for good; to take it in its plastic state before it has hardened in earth-formed habits. This is the appeal of the Divine Lover at Confirmation: "My son, give Me thine heart." The practical question resolves itself into this: Who shall shape my life—the principle of self or the life-giving Spirit of God? Like must produce like. Self must produce self. If God takes charge the result is a son or a daughter of God. We have the awful power of choosing between these two alternatives, and upon our choice depends our ultimate salvation or our eternal loss. If our human nature has the capacity for the higher ranges of life shut out from the reach of the animal world; and, knowing the possibility of a higher becoming, and hearing God's appeal, we choose the lower, preferring to shape our own lives as best we can, the result can never be what it might have been, had we accepted His direction, and chosen Him as our Guide and Leader.

> He fixed thee 'mid this dance
> Of plastic circumstance,
> This Present, thou, forsooth, wouldst fain arrest:
> Machinery just meant
> To give thy soul its bent,
> Try thee and turn thee forth, sufficiently impressed.

As we look round the world to-day, with its sad spectacle of human wreckage, the misshaped life without God, the results of men's yielding to the dictates of self, and sinning against the light, we may well urge the younger generation to profit by our mistakes and to give themselves to God in a more whole-hearted way, in the assurance that the power of His Spirit can alone shape and fashion our human nature into what it was meant to become and what it can never become without the direction of its Maker.

> So, take and use Thy work:
> Amend what flaws may lurk,
> What strains o' the stuff, what warpings past the aim!
> My times be in Thy hand:
> Perfect the cup as planned!
> Let age approve of youth, and death complete the same!

X. Conclusion

If, finally, our human personalities are incomplete and ever in process of becoming, if we wait upon the Holy Ghost for His activity in the recreation and building up of the new man in Christ Jesus; if our perfection is conditional upon His work in us and our activity in co-operation with His eternal purpose for our lives; we can see a reason for the peculiar emphasis, notably in the Anglican Church, upon the need for the young life receiving, through an apostolic rite, the advent of the Holy Spirit in increased measure at a critical period in our human growth, and we cannot be too thankful that the Church encourages our young people to look for such an advent; to fit themselves for it by adequate preparation of mind and heart, in intellectual appropriation of what the Church can teach them concerning the purpose of God for their lives, the function of God the Holy Spirit in this connexion, and the need for their prayerful supplication for His gift bestowed through the laying on of hands. That Confirmation can thus be in many a life a turning-point Godwards, a definite, conscious dedication of the self to His service, and a real experience of His Presence as He comes nearer to the living soul in response to the prayers of the Church and the candidate's own petition in the company of believers; this is a matter upon which the witness of centuries bears eloquent testimony. Nor, again, is such an advent of the Holy Ghost to be gauged, by the feeling of the candidate that it is so. The young are taught that, as the result of the laying on of hands, they are not to expect to feel better, but to be better. And, if the proof of His advent is to seek, it will be found in the fact that, as one looks back upon life after a period of years lived in communion with God in Christ, achieved as the result of faithful use of the means of grace, especially in the Blessed Sacrament of His Presence, we can point to definite guidance, help, encouragement, counsel, strength, in moments of temptation, comfort in sorrow and bereavement; we can bear witness to an overruling Providence in our lives, and with deep thankfulness of heart say: "Here, and at such a time in my life, God took me by the hand; this is the proof that His Holy Spirit did really enter more fully into my soul and at my invitation take charge as my Guide." So does the familiar hymn make itself felt as a reality:

> Our blest Redeemer, ere He breathed
> His tender, last farewell,
> A Guide, a Comforter bequeath'd
> With us to dwell.
>
> He came sweet influence to impart,
> A gracious, willing Guest,
> While He can find one humble heart
> Wherein to rest.

And His that gentle voice we hear,
Soft as the breath of even,
That checks each fault, that calms each fear,
And speaks of heaven.

And every virtue we possess,
And every conquest won,
And every thought of holiness,
Are His alone.

We may well conclude, then, with the words of a wise and saintly man of the past, Dean Hook :

" Not only for edification of mind, but for renovation of soul, does it seem expedient thus to defer the Confirmation of those who have been regenerated in infancy. The persons to be confirmed are generally those who are just commencing the career of life, just passing from parental control ; going forth into that world, which is to the Christian a field of battle, wherein, under the great Captain of his salvation, he is to fight the good fight of faith against the world, the flesh, and the devil. There, many an ambush is laid for their destruction, unless their eyes be opened by grace to perceive the pitfall : within are passions, at that age in their vigour, ready to betray them ; and the temptations which allure them from without assail their inexperience with more of fascination or of power than at any other period. Now, more, therefore, than at any other period of life, they stand in need of that strengthening grace which this ordinance has been instituted to convey. Now do they need to take unto themselves the whole armour of God—the breastplate of salvation, the sword of the Spirit. This, indeed, is the idea of Confirmation. It is the arming of the young Christian against the wiles of Satan ; it is the strengthening of the feeble hands ; the sending forth of him who has already been sworn in when he was baptized. He does not at Confirmation make new vows ; he only, before receiving the grace which he seeks, repeats the vows which are already upon him."

INDEX

African Church, 41, 251
Alcuin, 58
American Episcopal Church, 177, 211, 260
Aphraates, 33
Aquinas, 49, 160, 276, 277, 286, 290, 298
Armenian Church, 36
Augustine, 288, 298

Bancroft, Bp., 110, 111
Baptism, 6–15, 17, 21, 38, 72, 102, 105, 313–15
  separation from Confirmation, 37, 50–54, 106, 256, 286, 291
  unity with, 6, 23, 26–44, 105, 247–250, 281–283, 288
Baxter, Richard, 124, 140–143
Becon, Thomas, 79, 88, 93, 328
Benson, Bp. (of Glos.), 199, 225
Bentham, Bp., 87, 98
Beveridge, Bp. Wm., 182
Biblical References to Confirmation :
  O.T., 105
  Matt. xix., 110
  Mark i., 156
    xvi., 105
  Luke xxiv., 7
  John iii., 16, 156, 166
    xx., 16, 107
  Acts i., 107
    ii., 17, 157, 287
    vi., 11
    viii., 8, 22, 61, 64, 69, 89, 91, 105, 107, 111, 132, 135, 139, 141, 146, 150, 152, 156, 163, 166, 180, 187, 189, 210, 217, 247, 260, 282, 287, 289, 290
    ix., 6, 89, 248, 290
  Acts x., 248
    xiii., 7
    xiv., 11
    xv., 217
    xviii., 10
    xix., 9, 64, 69, 89, 91, 105, 107, 135, 139, 141, 146, 150, 156, 157, 163, 166, 180, 210, 247, 282, 287
  2 Cor. i., 160, 193
    ii., 280
  Eph. i., 157, 166, 193
    iv., 166, 193
  1 Tim. iv., 11
    v., 11
  2 Tim. i., 10, 247
  Titus iii., 13, 287
  Heb. vi., 10, 92, 106, 107, 110, 111, 135, 136, 141, 153, 180, 190, 193, 217, 246
  Apoc. i., 7
Blackburne, Archbp., 199, 225
Blow on the cheek, 132, 256, 271, 280
Bonner, Bp., 74
Bowdler, John, 208–210
Bright, Dr., 293
Bucer, 83
Bull, Bp. George, 183
Bull, Paul, 323–325
Burnet, Bp. Gilbert, 183
Bushnell, Dr., 305–310

Calfhill, James, 89–91, 328
Calvin, 94, 96, 104, 110, 131, 157, 163, 190
Calvinistic teaching, 88, 91, 97, 109, 113, 144, 175
Canfield, B., 163-164
Canons of 1603, 108, 136

Cartwright, Bp., 175–176
Cartwright, Thos., 94–95, 106
Catechism, 79, 87, 92, 98–99, 108, 217
Catechizing, 81, 85, 98–103, 125–128, 161, 169–174, 185, 192, 195–198
Cawdrey, Robert, 103–104
Cecil, Rev. Wm., 213–218
Chrism, 28, 51, 56, 61, 80, 114, 132, 139, 159, 167, 202–207, 231–243, 271, 275, 277, 280, 281–283, 296
Chrismalia, 38, 78, 79, 253 n.
Chrismation, 37, 42, 47, 66–68, 73–77, 79
Clarke, Samuel, 180–182
Clement of Alexandria, 30, 43
Confirmation, 21, 72
  address, 212, 218, 219
  age, 52–54, 62, 63, 71, 77, 87, 109, 118, 131, 134, 145, 160, 167, 176, 185, 189, 194, 195, 196, 200, 204, 205, 217, 278, 283
  a means of unity, 142, 151–152, 178
  a sacrament (?), 49, 64–70, 88–93, 107, 113, 131, 139, 141, 146, 152, 156, 165, 186, 212, 273
  before Communion, 82, 85, 87–88, 99, 116, 125–128, 136, 146, 165, 170–171, 194
  frequency of, 84, 108, 129, 166, 168, 194, 199, 201, 217, 219
  grace of, 66-70, 82, 88–93, 95, 107, 111, 131, 141, 159, 164, 167, 180, 187, 190, 276, 296, 327
  minister of, 54–57, 88, 111, 114, 134, 163, 277
    Apostles, 8, 48, 49, 55, 72, 95, 107, 146, 153, 167, 182, 187, 189, 191, 247
    Bishop, 45, 50, 88, 91, 106, 107, 108, 112, 138, 145, 151, 158, 165, 167, 179, 182, 189, 194, 273
    Presbyter, 54, 56, 134, 142, 252, 261, 262, 282
  preparation for, 79, 80, 82, 85, 108, 112, 148, 160, 173, 209, 212
  relation to Baptism, 6, 25, 92, 110, 132, 150, 165, 179, 181, 185, 192, 194, 209, 248, 283, 285-294, 315
Consecration of oil and chrism, 31, 36, 39–40, 54, 139, 202, 204, 282
Coptic Church, 35, 43, 250
  rite, 266
Cosin, Bp., 130–134, 148, 169
Coverdale, Bp. Miles, 123
Cox, 93, 98
Cranmer, 62, 65 ff., 72 ff., 85, 90, 96
Cross, sign of, 42, 66–68, 80, 83, 87, 114, 129, 132, 159, 194, 205, 231–243, 253, 257–8, 259, 271, 280, 281
Cyprian, 30, 44, 51, 75, 106, 146, 251, 289
Cyril of Jerusalem, 43, 194, 247, 249

Deacon, Bp. Thos., 203, 240
Dix, Dr. Morgan, 323–324
Drummond, Archbp., 200, 225–231
Drummond, Prof., 332–335

Eastern Churches, 36, 37, 42, 48, 57, 58, 275, 281–284, 291
Edward VI, 84
Egyptian Church, 57, 250
  Order, 264
English Use, 257-261, 292
Ephraim, 33
Erasmus, 80

Falconar, Bp. John, 204–206, 235
Falkener, Dr. W., 164
Fleetwood, Bp., 184–186
Forbes, Bp., 207
French Protestants, 253, 261

Gallican Uses, 251–252
  rites, 268
Gerard, Bp. Andrew, 207
Geste, Bp., 87, 98
Gilbert, Archbp., 226
Girding the loins, 255
Gnostics, 32, 43

Gordon, Bp. Robert, 207–208
Greek rites, 36, 44, 250
Gregory the Great, 56
Grindal, Archbp., 93, 98, 99

Hall, Bp. Joseph, 122, 134–137
Hammond, Dr. H., 137–140
Hampton Court Conference, 93, 109
Heber, Bp. Reginald, 211–212
Henry VIII, 61
Heretics, reception of, 44–45
Hermann of Cologne, 81
Herring, Archbp., 198–199, 224
Hippolytus, 29, 43, 250
Hoadly, Bp. Benjamin, 186–188
Holy Communion :
  age of communion, 57–59, 87, 98, 127, 134, 169, 173, 185, 186, 196
  before confirmation, 51, 58, 125–128, 161, 176, 189, 196, 278
  conditions of admission, 82, 85, 98–101, 144, 165, 170–171, 195
  in lieu of confirmation, 142, 186, 198
  of infants, 50, 59, 131, 256, 287
Holy Spirit, the, 299–312, 329
Holy Spirit, gift of, 8–22, 45, 52, 60–68, 248–249
  in Baptism, 6, 287
  in Confirmation, 9, 46–48, 60, 105 138, 140, 149–150, 165, 166, 179, 180, 189, 210–211, 217, 252, 257, 281–283, 297, 315
  in ordination, 11
Hooker, Richard, 103, 104–108, 175

Innocent I, 37
Institution of a Christian Man, 62, 71
Insufflation, 250
Irenæus, 29, 41, 105, 247, 288

James I, 110–113
Jerome, 46, 54, 95, 106, 112, 146, 286
Jewel, Bp., 89–91, 96
John the Baptist, 14, 19

Kiss, 253, 254

Laud, Archbp., 118, 125
Law, William, 187, 188
Laying on of hands, 105, 137, 139, 190, 274, 282, 329, 330–332
  blessing, 2, 7, 45
  confirmation, 8, 17, 25, 30, 41–44, 46–50, 66–71, 79, 80, 84, 88, 95–97, 107, 141, 146, 149, 154, 157, 159, 167, 205, 247–254, 256, 257, 271
  healing, 2, 5, 190
  ordination, 3, 4, 10, 11, 22, 150
  penance, 150
  semikah, 3–4
  transference, 4, 22, 60, 135, 180
Lee, Archbp., 65 ff., 72 ff.
Lighted taper, 255
Luther, 61, 80
Lutheran practices, 80, 253, 261

Mary I, 83–86
Mason, Dr., 286–289, 293
Matthew, Archbp. Tobias, 110, 119–122
Milk and honey, 255
Moberly, Bp., 213

Name, use of, 83, 128, 202, 203, 233–241, 257, 272
  change of, 86, 128–129
Necessary Doctrine and Erudition, 76
Nonjurors, 177, 201–204, 207–208, 211
  confirmation offices, 201, 231–243
Nowell, Dean, 92, 96

Oman, Dr., 312–313, 316–317
Origen, 43

Parker, Archbp., 98
Pearson, Bp., 172
Peckham, Archbp., 58, 82
Pentecost, 16, 20
Prayer, Book of :
  1549, 80, 257
  1552, 83, 258
  1559, 86, 88
  1662, 147, 257
Puller, Fr., 286–289, 293

Questionnaire of 1537, 64–71
  1540, 72–76

Rattray, Bp., 204, 206, 236
Reynolds, Dr., 111
Ridley, Bp., 85
Rogers, Thomas, 113–114
Roman Use, 37, 205, 252–253, 256, 270–281
Ryder, Bp. Henry, 219

Sacraments, 319–338
Sancroft, Archbp. William, 174, 175
Sandys, Archbp., 93, 99
Sarapion, 35, 247
Sarum Use, 52, 82
Savoy Conference, 144–147
Saywell, Samuel, 178
Scotland, 112, 201–208, 235–240, 259
Scott, Bp. Cuthbert, 84–85
Seabury, Bp. S., 211
Secker, Archbp., 198–191
South, Dr. Robert, 165–166
Sponsors, 82, 132, 145, 204, 240, 241, 257, 272, 277, 278
Stevens, William, 210
Sumner, Bp. Charles, 219
Syrian Churches, 31–34, 36, 42, 47, 247
  rite, 264

Taylor, Jeremy, 84, 134, 154–162, 175, 211–212
Taylor, Bp. Ralph, 177
Tertullian, 29, 30, 41, 106, 247, 251, 288
Thirty-nine Articles, 92
Thorndike, Herbert, 134, 149–153
Tridentine Catechism, 49
"Turkish Spy" Letter, 59
Tyndale, 78 ff.

Unction, 12, 25, 28–38, 45, 46–50, 194, 205, 247–254

Vernon-Harcourt, Archbp., 219–220
Visitation Articles, XVIth cent., 85–86, 97–103
Visitation Articles, XVIIth cent., 115–117, 125–128, 168–174, 195–198

Walpole, Bp., 325–326
Washing of feet, 254–255
Wesley, John, 195
Wheatley, Charles, 193–195
White robe, 254
Whitgift, Archbp., 94–97, 100, 102, 104, 110
Wilberforce, Bp. Samuel, 220–221
Wilson, Bp. Thomas, 191
Wolsey, 77–78

Young, Archbp., 87, 98

Made and Printed in Great Britain
by Hazell, Watson & Viney Ld.
London and Aylesbury

DATE DUE

BV 815 .C6635 v.1

Confirmation

Historical and Doctrinal

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINA

Confirmation :
3 0645 0005 5548 8